

# REDUCED qKZ EQUATION AND CORRELATION FUNCTIONS OF THE XXZ MODEL

H. BOOS, M. JIMBO, T. MIWA, F. SMIRNOV AND Y. TAKEYAMA

**ABSTRACT.** Correlation functions of the XXZ model in the massive and massless regimes are known to satisfy a system of linear equations. The main relations among them are the difference equations obtained from the qKZ equation by specializing the variables  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{2n})$  as  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, \lambda_n + 1, \dots, \lambda_1 + 1)$ . We call it the reduced qKZ equation. In this article we construct a special family of solutions to this system. They can be written as linear combinations of products of two transcendental functions  $\tilde{\omega}, \omega$  with coefficients being rational functions. We show that correlation functions of the XXZ model in the massive regime are given by these formulas with an appropriate choice of  $\tilde{\omega}, \omega$ . We also present a conjectural formula in the massless regime.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Correlation functions of integrable spin chains in one dimension have been a subject of intensive study. In the most typical case of the XXX and the XXZ models, they are given in the form

$$(1.1) \quad g_{2n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, \lambda_n + 1, \dots, \lambda_1 + 1),$$

where  $g_{2n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{2n})$  is a certain solution of the quantum Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov (qKZ) equation of ‘level  $-4$ ’ [10]. The specialized function (1.1) satisfies a similar system of difference equations, which we refer to as the reduced qKZ equation. Multi-dimensional integral representations for the correlation functions have been known for some time [11, 8, 14]. It has been recognized through the recent works [2, 15, 12, 13] that, at least for small  $n$ , these multiple integrals can be reduced to one-dimensional integrals, thus making it possible to evaluate them explicitly. The reason for this mysterious reducibility was subsequently explained via a duality between the qKZ equation of level 0 and level  $-4$  [3, 4, 5]. In these works, the following general *Ansatz* was proposed. Consider an inhomogeneous XXX model where each site  $j$  carries an independent spectral parameter  $\lambda_j$ . Then the ground state average of products of elementary operators  $(E_{\epsilon_j, \bar{\epsilon}_j})_j$  can be written in the form

$$(1.2) \quad \langle \text{vac} | (E_{\epsilon_1, \bar{\epsilon}_1})_1 \cdots (E_{\epsilon_n, \bar{\epsilon}_n})_n | \text{vac} \rangle \\ = \sum_{m=0}^{[n/2]} \sum_{I, J} \prod_{p=1}^m \omega^{XXX}(\lambda_{i_p} - \lambda_{j_p}) f_{n, I, J}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n),$$

---

*Date:* February 1, 2008.

where  $\omega^{XXX}(\lambda)$  is a certain transcendental function,  $f_{n,I,J}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  are rational functions, and the sum is taken over  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_m), J = (j_1, \dots, j_m) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^m$ , such that  $i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_m$  are distinct,  $i_p < j_p$  ( $1 \leq p \leq m$ ) and  $i_1 < \dots < i_m$ . However the rational functions  $f_{n,I,J}$  were not described. In [6], it was explained that a similar formula continues to hold for the correlation functions of quantum group reduction of the XXZ model.

In the present paper we consider the genuine XXZ model (without quantum group reduction). Let  $\Delta = \cos \pi \nu$  be the coupling constant of the XXZ chain (see (13.1)), and set  $q = e^{\pi i \nu}$ . We arrange the correlation functions into a function  $h_n^{Corr}$  with values in  $V^{\otimes 2n}$ , where  $V = \mathbb{C}v_+ \oplus \mathbb{C}v_-$ . Set  $s = v_+ \otimes v_- - v_- \otimes v_+$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_n = \prod_{p=1}^n s_{p, 2n-p+1} \in V^{\otimes 2n}$  (as usual, the lower indices indicate the tensor components, see Section 2).

We adopt the following approach. It has been said that the correlation functions solve the reduced qKZ equation. We start with this equation and find some class of solutions. An arbitrary solution from this class will be denoted by  $h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ . The building block of the formula for  $h_n$  is a family of operators

$$\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \text{End}(V^{\otimes 2n}) \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq n,$$

which are mutually commutative for fixed  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  and satisfy the equation:

$$(1.3) \quad \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(k,l)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = 0 \quad \text{if } \{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} \neq \emptyset.$$

The solution  $h_n \in V^{\otimes 2n}$  has the following form:

$$(1.4) \quad h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = 2^{-n} e^{\widehat{\Omega}_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)} \mathbf{s}_n,$$

where

$$\widehat{\Omega}_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \sum_{i < j} \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n).$$

The expansion for the exponential in (1.4) terminates due to (1.3).

The operators  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$  as functions of the parameters  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  are of very special form:

$$(1.5) \quad \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \tilde{\omega}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \widetilde{W}_n^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) + \omega(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) W_n^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n),$$

where  $\widetilde{W}_n^{(i,j)}, W_n^{(i,j)}$  depend rationally on  $\zeta_k = e^{\pi i \nu \lambda_k}$  ( $k = 1, \dots, n$ ), and  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda), \omega(\lambda)$  are scalar functions satisfying a system of difference equations. Since the series terminates, the functions  $\tilde{\omega}, \omega$  in the formula for  $h_n$  appear with total degree not higher than  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ .

Finally, the rational functions  $\widetilde{W}_n^{(i,j)}, W_n^{(i,j)}$  are defined through the trace of a certain monodromy matrix (see (3.2), (3.3), (3.4), (3.6), (12.2)). Here by ‘trace’ we mean the unique linear map

$$\text{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta} : U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \otimes \mathbb{C}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}] \rightarrow \lambda \mathbb{C}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}] \oplus \mathbb{C}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}],$$

which reduces to the usual trace on the  $(k+1)$ -dimensional irreducible representation when  $\lambda = k+1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  and  $\zeta = q^{k+1}$ . The structure of  $\text{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta}$  conforms to the appearance of *two* transcendental functions, which is the main new feature in the

XXZ case. In the body of the text, we use only the difference equation (2.12) and the parity condition (2.15) for  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda), \omega(\lambda)$  and prove that the above formula for  $h_n$  satisfies the reduced qKZ equation and other relations.

Then we return to correlation functions. It has been mentioned that we describe a class of solutions to the reduced qKZ equation. Indeed, solutions to difference equations for  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda), \omega(\lambda)$  are not unique. Different choices of  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda), \omega(\lambda)$  correspond to different solutions  $h_n$ . We have to choose the one which describes the correlation functions. The explicit form of  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda), \omega(\lambda)$  are determined from the case  $n = 2$  in each regime (see (13.2)–(13.5)). Actually, for this particular solution which we call  $h_n^{Ansatz}$  the functions  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda), \omega(\lambda)$  are ‘minimal’: they are bounded at infinity having the minimal possible number of poles in a certain strip.

It remains to show that our solution describes the correlation functions:

$$h_n^{Ansatz} = h_n^{Corr}.$$

In the present paper we prove that this is indeed the case in the massive regime. Although we were not able to prove this fact in the massless regime, we have no doubt that we found the correct solution for the following reasons. First,  $h_n^{Ansatz}$  coincides with  $h_n^{Corr}$  which was calculated by other means (starting with original multi-dimensional integral formulae [8]) for  $n = 2, 3$ . Second,  $h_n^{Ansatz}$  reproduces the correct result in the XXX limit.

Concerning the XXX model it should be said that a formula similar to (1.4) can be obtained by taking the limit from the XXZ case. The operator  $\hat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$  simplifies as follows:

$$\hat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j) \text{ XXX}}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \omega^{\text{XXX}}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) W_n^{(i,j) \text{ XXX}}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$$

where  $W_n^{(i,j) \text{ XXX}}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  is a rational function of  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  (see (13.12)). Thus the formula (1.4) gives a new representation even for the XXX model.

We come to the final formula (1.4) in several steps. First, we present it using operators  ${}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  which belong to  $\text{Hom}(V^{\otimes 2(n-2)}, V^{\otimes 2n})$ . This presentation is quite useful for calculations with small  $n$ . We prove that  $h_n$  in this form satisfies the reduced qKZ equation as well as some other relations. We then show that the result can be rewritten in the compact form (1.4).

The plan of the text follows the logic explained above. In Section 2, we formulate the reduced qKZ equation and related properties satisfied by the correlation functions. In Section 3, we introduce operators  ${}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$  which belong to  $\text{Hom}(V^{\otimes 2(n-2)}, V^{\otimes 2n}) \otimes ((\lambda_i - \lambda_j)\mathbb{C}[\zeta_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, \zeta_n^{\pm 1}] \oplus \mathbb{C}[\zeta_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, \zeta_n^{\pm 1}])$  and use them to construct  ${}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$ . In Sections 4 and 5, we describe the main properties of  ${}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$ , from which the reduced qKZ equation and other properties for  $h_n$  can be deduced. Sections 6–11 are devoted to the proof of the statements given in Section 5. In Section 12 we prove the compact formula (1.4) for the  $h_n$ . In Section 13, we discuss the connection between the formula given in Section 3 and the correlation functions. Theorem 3.1, Theorem 12.4 and Theorem 13.4 are the main results of this paper.

## 2. REDUCED QKZ EQUATION

Throughout the paper we fix a complex number  $\nu \notin \mathbb{Q}$ .

Let  $V = \mathbb{C}^2$  be a two-dimensional vector space with basis  $v_+, v_-$ . We use the standard trigonometric  $R$  matrix

$$(2.1) \quad R(\lambda) = \rho(\lambda) \frac{r(\lambda)}{[\lambda + 1]} \in \text{End}(V \otimes V),$$

$$(2.2) \quad r(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} [\lambda + 1] & & & \\ & [\lambda] & 1 & \\ & 1 & [\lambda] & \\ & & & [\lambda + 1] \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$[\lambda] := \frac{\sin \pi \nu \lambda}{\sin \pi \nu}.$$

In (2.2), the entries are arranged according to the order  $v_+ \otimes v_+, v_+ \otimes v_-, v_- \otimes v_+, v_- \otimes v_-$ . The factor  $\rho(\lambda)$  is a meromorphic function subject to the relations

$$\rho(\lambda)\rho(-\lambda) = 1, \quad \rho(\lambda)\rho(\lambda - 1) = \frac{[\lambda]}{[1 - \lambda]}.$$

Its explicit form is irrelevant here (see (13.4)). We set also

$$\check{R}(\lambda) = PR(\lambda),$$

where  $P \in \text{End}(V \otimes V)$  stands for the permutation  $P(u \otimes v) = v \otimes u$ .

For an element  $x \in \text{End}(V)$ , we set  $x_j = \text{id}^{\otimes(j-1)} \otimes x \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes(N-j)} \in \text{End}(V^{\otimes N})$ . Similarly, if  $y = \sum_{\nu} y_{\nu}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes y_{\nu}^{(k)} \in \text{End}(V^{\otimes k})$ , we let  $y_{i_1, \dots, i_k} = \sum_{\nu} (y_{\nu}^{(1)})_{i_1} \cdots (y_{\nu}^{(k)})_{i_k} \in \text{End}(V^{\otimes N})$ . An element  $\sigma$  of the symmetric group  $S_N$  acts on  $V^{\otimes N}$  as  $(v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_N)^{\sigma} = v_{\sigma^{-1}(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{\sigma^{-1}(N)}$ . If  $u \in V^{\otimes k}$ ,  $v \in V^{\otimes l}$  and

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & k & k+1 & \cdots & k+l \\ i_1 & \cdots & i_k & j_1 & \cdots & j_l \end{pmatrix},$$

we write  $(u \otimes v)^{\sigma}$  as  $u_{i_1, \dots, i_k} v_{j_1, \dots, j_l}$ . Often we fix  $n$  and consider the tensor power  $V^{\otimes 2n}$ . When there is no fear of confusion we will write  $\bar{j} = 2n - j + 1$ .

Consider the following system of equations for a sequence  $\{h_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  of unknown functions  $h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in V^{\otimes 2n}$  with  $h_0 = 1$ :

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & h_n(\cdots, \lambda_{j+1}, \lambda_j, \cdots) \\ &= \check{R}_{j,j+1}(\lambda_{j,j+1}) \check{R}_{\bar{j}+1, \bar{j}}(\lambda_{j+1, j}) h_n(\cdots, \lambda_j, \lambda_{j+1}, \cdots) \quad (1 \leq j \leq n-1), \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.4) \quad h_n(\lambda_1 - 1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) = A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) h_n(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n),$$

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{P}_{1, \bar{1}}^- \cdot h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \frac{1}{2} s_{1, \bar{1}} h_{n-1}(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)_{2, \dots, n, \bar{n}, \dots, \bar{2}}.$$

Here  $\lambda_{i,j} = \lambda_i - \lambda_j$ ,  $\mathcal{P}^- := \frac{1}{2}(1 - P)$ ,

$$(2.6) \quad s := v_+ \otimes v_- - v_- \otimes v_+ \in V \otimes V,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.7) \quad & A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\
&= (-1)^n R_{\bar{1}, \bar{2}}(\lambda_{1,2} - 1) \cdots R_{\bar{1}, \bar{n}}(\lambda_{1,n} - 1) P_{1, \bar{1}} R_{1,n}(\lambda_{1,n}) \cdots R_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2}) \\
&= - \prod_{p=2}^n \frac{1}{[\lambda_{1,p} - 1][\lambda_{1,p} + 1]} \\
&\quad \times r_{\bar{1}, \bar{2}}(\lambda_{1,2} - 1) \cdots r_{\bar{1}, \bar{n}}(\lambda_{1,n} - 1) P_{1, \bar{1}} r_{1,n}(\lambda_{1,n}) \cdots r_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Define an operator  ${}_{n-1}\Pi_n \in \text{Hom}(V^{\otimes 2n}, V^{\otimes 2(n-1)})$  by

$$(2.8) \quad \mathcal{P}_{1, \bar{1}}^- u = s_{1, \bar{1}} ({}_{n-1}\Pi_n u)_{2, \dots, n, \bar{n}, \dots, \bar{2}}.$$

Then (2.5) can be written as

$${}_{n-1}\Pi_n \cdot h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \frac{1}{2} h_{n-1}(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n).$$

These equations arise as ones satisfied by the correlation functions of the XXZ model [10]. We review this connection in Section 13. Eqs. (2.3), (2.4) imply a reduced form of the usual quantum Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equation of ‘level  $-4$ ’:

$$(2.9) \quad h_n(\dots, \lambda_j - 1, \dots) = A_n^{(j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) h_n(\dots, \lambda_j, \dots),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.10) \quad & A_n^{(j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\
&= (-1)^n R_{j, j-1}(\lambda_{j, j-1} - 1) \cdots R_{j, 1}(\lambda_{j, 1} - 1) R_{\bar{j}, \bar{j}+1}(\lambda_{j, j+1} - 1) \cdots R_{\bar{j}, \bar{n}}(\lambda_{j, n} - 1) \\
&\quad \times P_{j, \bar{j}} R_{j, n}(\lambda_{j, n}) \cdots R_{j, j+1}(\lambda_{j, j+1}) R_{\bar{j}, \bar{1}}(\lambda_{j, 1}) \cdots R_{\bar{j}, \bar{j}-1}(\lambda_{j, j-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

We call (2.9) the reduced qKZ equation. The constraint (2.5) is compatible in the sense that, if  $h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  satisfies the (2.9), then so does  $\mathcal{P}_{1, \bar{1}}^- h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  with respect to  $(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$  and with  $n$  replaced by  $n-1$ .

Assigning a weight  $\text{wt}(v_{\pm}) = \pm 1$ , we have the decomposition into weight subspaces  $V^{\otimes 2n} = \bigoplus_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} (V^{\otimes 2n})_l$ . The reduced qKZ equation is satisfied by each weight component of  $h_n$ . In this paper we consider only the component of zero weight,  $h_n \in (V^{\otimes 2n})_0$ , since this is the case relevant to correlation functions.

Viewed as a system of difference equations, our reduced qKZ equation is highly reducible. In the first non-trivial case  $n=2$ , there exist functions  $\tilde{f}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2), f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in V^{\otimes 4}$  depending rationally on  $\zeta_j = e^{\pi i \nu \lambda_j}$  such that the transformation

$$(2.11) \quad h_2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \tilde{\omega}(\lambda_{1,2}) \tilde{f}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \omega(\lambda_{1,2}) f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + 1 \cdot \frac{1}{4} s_{1, \bar{1}} s_{2, \bar{2}}$$

brings (2.3)–(2.4) into the triangular form,

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\omega}(\lambda - 1) \\ \omega(\lambda - 1) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & p(\lambda) + \tilde{p}(\lambda) \\ 0 & 1 & p(\lambda) \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\omega}(\lambda) \\ \omega(\lambda) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = 0,$$

where

$$(2.13) \quad \tilde{p}(\lambda) := \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{[\lambda-1][\lambda-2]} - \frac{1}{4} \frac{[2]}{[\lambda-1][\lambda+1]},$$

$$(2.14) \quad p(\lambda) := \frac{3}{4} \frac{1}{[\lambda][\lambda-1]} - \frac{1}{4} \frac{[3]}{[\lambda-2][\lambda+1]},$$

together with the parity condition:

$$(2.15) \quad \tilde{\omega}(\lambda) = -\tilde{\omega}(-\lambda), \quad \omega(\lambda) = \omega(-\lambda).$$

Solutions of (2.12) relevant to the XXZ model will be given in Section 13, (13.2)–(13.5).

Remarkably, the formula (2.11) generalizes for any  $n$  as follows:

$$(2.16) \quad h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \sum_{I,J} \tilde{\omega}_I \omega_J \cdot f_{I,J},$$

where  $\tilde{\omega}_I = \prod_{(i,j) \in I} \tilde{\omega}(\lambda_{i,j})$ ,  $\omega_J = \prod_{(i,j) \in J} \omega(\lambda_{i,j})$ ,  $f_{I,J}$  are rational functions in  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n$  and the sum ranges over  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_m)$ ,  $J = (j_1, \dots, j_m) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^m$ , such that  $i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_m$  are distinct,  $i_p < j_p$  ( $1 \leq p \leq m$ ) and  $i_1 < \dots < i_m$ . A precise formulation is stated in Theorem 3.1. In this paper, we prove the existence of solutions to (2.3)–(2.5) of the form (2.16), by constructing the rational functions  $f_{I,J}$  explicitly.

### 3. CONSTRUCTION OF $h_n$

In this section we introduce the solution  $h_n$  and state the result.

In the following construction, a key role will be played by a family of linear maps

$${}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \text{Hom}(V^{\otimes 2(n-2)}, V^{\otimes 2n}) \quad (1 \leq i < j \leq n)$$

depending on the parameters  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ . They can be viewed as certain transfer matrices whose auxiliary spaces have ‘fractional dimension’. We begin by defining these objects.

Let  $q = e^{\pi i \nu}$ . Let  $E, F, q^{\pm H/2}$  be the standard generators of  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ . Define the  $L$  operator by the formula

$$(3.1) \quad L(\lambda) := \begin{pmatrix} \left[ \lambda + \frac{1+H}{2} \right] & \tilde{F} \\ \tilde{E} & \left[ \lambda + \frac{1-H}{2} \right] \end{pmatrix} \in U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \otimes \text{End}(V),$$

where  $\tilde{F} = Fq^{(H-1)/2}$ ,  $\tilde{E} = q^{-(H-1)/2}E$ . Denote by  $\pi^{(k)} : U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow \text{End}(V^{(k)})$  the  $(k+1)$ -dimensional irreducible representation. There exists a unique  $\mathbb{C}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}]$ -linear map

$$\text{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta} : U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \otimes \mathbb{C}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}] \longrightarrow \lambda \mathbb{C}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}] \oplus \mathbb{C}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}]$$

such that

$$\text{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta}(A) \Big|_{\lambda=k+1, \zeta=q^{k+1}} = \text{tr}_{V^{(k)}}(\pi^{(k)}(A)) \quad (\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})$$

holds for all  $A \in U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ . For the properties of  $\text{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta}$ , see Section 5. An element  $f(\lambda, \zeta) \in \mathbb{C}[\lambda, \zeta, \zeta^{-1}]$  is determined by knowing  $f(\lambda, q^\lambda)$  (see Lemma 7.1 below). For this reason we will mainly consider

$$\text{Tr}_\lambda(A) := \text{Tr}_{\lambda, q^\lambda}(A).$$

Notation being as above, we define

$$(3.2) \quad {}_n X_{n-2}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)(u) \\ := \frac{1}{[\lambda_{1,2}] \prod_{p=3}^n [\lambda_{1,p}] [\lambda_{2,p}]} \text{Tr}_{\lambda_{1,2}} \left( T_n^{[1]} \left( \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}{2} \right) \right) (s_{1,2} s_{1,2} u_{3,\dots,n,\bar{n},\dots,\bar{3}}).$$

Here  $u \in V^{\otimes 2(n-2)}$ ,  $s$  is given in (2.6), and  $T_n^{[i]}(\lambda) \in U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \otimes \text{End}(V^{\otimes 2n})$  stands for the ‘monodromy matrix’

$$T_n^{[i]}(\lambda; \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = L_{\bar{1}}(\lambda - \lambda_1 - 1) \cdots \widehat{L_{\bar{i}}(\lambda - \lambda_i - 1)} \cdots L_{\bar{n}}(\lambda - \lambda_n - 1) \\ \times L_n(\lambda - \lambda_n) \cdots \widehat{L_i(\lambda - \lambda_i)} \cdots L_1(\lambda - \lambda_1).$$

In the above, we have abbreviated  $T_n^{[i]}(\lambda; \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  to  $T_n^{[i]}(\lambda)$ . In general, we define

$$(3.3) \quad {}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ = \mathbb{R}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_n X_{n-2}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \lambda_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda_i}, \dots, \widehat{\lambda_j}, \dots, \lambda_n),$$

where

$$(3.4) \quad \mathbb{R}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ := \check{R}_{i,i-1}(\lambda_{i,i-1}) \cdots \check{R}_{2,1}(\lambda_{i,1}) \\ \times \check{R}_{j,j-1}(\lambda_{j,j-1}) \cdots \check{R}_{i+2,i+1}(\lambda_{j,i+1}) \cdot \check{R}_{i+1,i}(\lambda_{j,i-1}) \cdots \check{R}_{3,2}(\lambda_{j,1}) \\ \times \check{R}_{\overline{i-1},\bar{i}}(\lambda_{i-1,i}) \cdots \check{R}_{\bar{1}\bar{2}}(\lambda_{1,i}) \\ \times \check{R}_{\overline{j-1},\bar{j}}(\lambda_{j-1,j}) \cdots \check{R}_{\overline{i+1},\bar{i+2}}(\lambda_{i+1,j}) \cdot \check{R}_{\bar{i},\bar{i+1}}(\lambda_{i-1,j}) \cdots \check{R}_{\bar{2},\bar{3}}(\lambda_{1,j}).$$

The complicated expression of  $\mathbb{R}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  can be understood as a chain of processes of reversing the order of arguments. (See (4.1).) Using the Yang-Baxter relation

$$(3.5) \quad R_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2}) L_2(\lambda - \lambda_2) L_1(\lambda - \lambda_1) = L_1(\lambda - \lambda_1) L_2(\lambda - \lambda_2) R_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2}),$$

it can be written alternatively as

$${}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)(u) = R_{i,i-1}(\lambda_{i,i-1}) \cdots R_{i,1}(\lambda_{i,1}) R_{\overline{i-1},\bar{i}}(\lambda_{i-1,i}) \cdots R_{\bar{1},\bar{i}}(\lambda_{1,i}) \\ \times \frac{1}{[\lambda_{i,j}] \prod_{p \neq i,j} [\lambda_{i,p}] [\lambda_{j,p}]} \text{Tr}_{\lambda_{i,j}} \left( T_n^{[i]} \left( \frac{\lambda_i + \lambda_j}{2} \right) \right) \\ \times R_{j,j-1}(\lambda_{j,j-1}) \cdots \widehat{R_{j,i}(\lambda_{j,i})} \cdots R_{j,1}(\lambda_{j,1}) R_{\overline{j-1},\bar{j}}(\lambda_{j-1,j}) \cdots \widehat{R_{\bar{i},\bar{j}}(\lambda_{i,j})} \cdots R_{\bar{1},\bar{j}}(\lambda_{1,j}) \\ \times \left( s_{i,\bar{j}} s_{\bar{i},j} u_{1,\dots,\widehat{i},\dots,\widehat{j},\dots,n,\bar{n},\dots,\widehat{j},\dots,\widehat{i},\dots,\bar{1}} \right).$$

By the definition,  ${}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$  has the structure

$$(3.6) \quad {}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = -\lambda_{i,j} \cdot {}_n \tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) + {}_n G_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n),$$

where  ${}_n\tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)$  and  ${}_nG_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)$  are rational functions in  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n$ . The properties of  ${}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$  will be discussed in Section 4.

With each solution  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda), \omega(\lambda)$  of the difference equation (2.12) and the parity condition (2.15), we now associate a  $V^{\otimes 2n}$ -valued function  $h_n$  as follows. Set

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} &{}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ &:= \tilde{\omega}(\lambda_{i,j}) \cdot {}_n\tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) + \omega(\lambda_{i,j}) \cdot {}_nG_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n). \end{aligned}$$

For an ordered set of indices  $K = \{k_1, \dots, k_m\}$  ( $1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_m \leq n$ ), we use the abbreviated notation

$$(3.8) \quad \Omega_{K, (k_i, k_j)} = {}_m\Omega_{m-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_{k_1}, \dots, \lambda_{k_m}).$$

We set also

$$\mathbf{s}_m := \prod_{p=1}^m s_{p, \bar{p}}.$$

Define

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} &h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ &:= \sum_{m=0}^{[n/2]} \frac{(-1)^m}{2^{n-2m}} \sum \Omega_{K_1, (i_1, j_1)} \circ \Omega_{K_2, (i_2, j_2)} \circ \dots \circ \Omega_{K_m, (i_m, j_m)} (\mathbf{s}_{n-2m}). \end{aligned}$$

Here the second sum is taken over all sequences  $i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_m$  of distinct elements of  $K_1 = \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $i_1 < \dots < i_m$  and  $i_1 < j_1, \dots, i_m < j_m$ . The  $K_l$  ( $l = 2, \dots, m$ ) are subsets of  $K_1$  obtained by removing  $i_{l-1}, j_{l-1}$  from  $K_{l-1}$ . For instance, if  $n = 4$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} h_4(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4) &= \sum_{3 \text{ terms}} {}_4\Omega_2^{(1,2)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4) \circ {}_2\Omega_0^{(1,2)}(\lambda_3, \lambda_4)(1) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{6 \text{ terms}} {}_4\Omega_2^{(1,2)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4)(\mathbf{s}_2) + \frac{1}{16} \mathbf{s}_4. \end{aligned}$$

Expanding (3.9) in terms of  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda_{i,j})$  and  $\omega(\lambda_{i,j})$ , we obtain an expression of the type (2.16).

We are now in a position to state the result.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda), \omega(\lambda)$  be a solution of the difference equation (2.12) and the parity condition (2.15). Define  $h_n$  by (3.9), where  ${}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$  are given by (3.6) and (3.7). Then  $h_n$  satisfies the reduced  $qKZ$  equation (2.3), (2.4) as well as (2.5).*

*Example.*

In the simplest non-trivial case  $n = 2$ , we have the following representation for  $h_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} h_2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= -\tilde{\omega}(\lambda_{1,2}) \cdot {}_2\tilde{G}_0(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)(1) - \omega(\lambda_{1,2}) \cdot {}_2G_0(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)(1) + \frac{1}{4}s_{1,\bar{1}}s_{2,\bar{2}}, \\ (q - q^{-1})^2 \cdot {}_2\tilde{G}_0(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)(1) &= \frac{q^2 - q^{-2}}{\zeta - \zeta^{-1}}A + \frac{(\zeta + \zeta^{-1})(q - q^{-1})}{\zeta - \zeta^{-1}}B, \\ (q - q^{-1})^2 \cdot {}_2G_0(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)(1) &= (\zeta + \zeta^{-1})A + (q + q^{-1})B, \\ A &= (+ - - +) + (- + + -), \\ B &= (+ + - -) + (- - + +) + (+ - + -) + (- + - +), \end{aligned}$$

Here we have set  $\zeta = \zeta_1/\zeta_2$  and  $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \bar{\epsilon}_2, \bar{\epsilon}_1) = v_{\epsilon_1} \otimes v_{\epsilon_2} \otimes v_{\bar{\epsilon}_2} \otimes v_{\bar{\epsilon}_1}$ .

The following sections are devoted to the proof of the theorem.

#### 4. REDUCTION OF REDUCED QKZ EQUATION

The system of equations (2.3), (2.4), (2.5) for  $h_n$  is based on the following five properties.

**Exchange relation:**

$$(4.1) \quad {}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\cdots, \lambda_{k+1}, \lambda_k, \cdots) = \check{R}_{k,k+1}(\lambda_{k,k+1})\check{R}_{k+1,\bar{k}}(\lambda_{k+1,k}) \\ \times \begin{cases} {}_nX_{n-2}^{(k,k+1)}(\cdots, \lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1}, \cdots), & (i = k, j = k+1), \\ {}_nX_{n-2}^{(\pi_k(i), \pi_k(j))}(\cdots, \lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1}, \cdots), & (\sharp(\{i, j\} \cap \{k, k+1\}) = 1), \\ {}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\cdots, \lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1}, \cdots) \\ \quad \times \check{R}_{k',k'+1}(\lambda_{k,k+1})^{-1}\check{R}_{k+1,\bar{k}'}(\lambda_{k+1,k})^{-1}, & (\{i, j\} \cap \{k, k+1\} = \emptyset). \end{cases}$$

Here  $\pi_k$  signifies the transposition  $(k, k+1)$ , and in the last line  $k'$  signifies the position of  $\lambda_k$  appearing in  $(\lambda_1, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_i, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_j, \cdots, \lambda_n)$ .

**Difference equations:**

$$(4.2) \quad {}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_k - 1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \\ = -A_n^{(k)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \quad (k = i, j), \\ (4.3) \quad {}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_k - 1, \cdots, \lambda_n) = A_n^{(k)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \\ \times A_{n-2}^{(k')}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_i, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_j, \cdots, \lambda_n)^{-1} \quad (k \neq i, j).$$

Here  $k'$  signifies the position of  $\lambda_k$  appearing in  $(\lambda_1, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_i, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_j, \cdots, \lambda_n)$ .

**Commutativity:** For distinct indices  $i, j, k, l$ ,

$$(4.4) \quad {}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-2}X_{n-4}^{(k',l')}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_i, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_j, \cdots, \lambda_n) \\ = {}_nX_{n-2}^{(k,l)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-2}X_{n-4}^{(i',j')}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_k, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_l, \cdots, \lambda_n).$$

Here  $k'$  and  $l'$  signify the positions of  $\lambda_k, \lambda_l$  appearing in  $(\lambda_1, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_i, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_j, \cdots, \lambda_n)$ .

Likewise  $i'$  and  $j'$  signify the positions of  $\lambda_i, \lambda_j$  appearing in  $(\lambda_1, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_k, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_l, \cdots, \lambda_n)$ .

**Cancellation identity:**

$$(4.5) \quad 4 \sum_{j=2}^n {}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}) = (A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1} - 1)(\mathbf{s}_n).$$

**Recurrence relation:**

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & {}_{n-1} \Pi_n \circ {}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & (1 = i < j \leq n), \\ {}_{n-1} X_{n-3}^{(i-1,j-1)}(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-3} \Pi_{n-2} & (2 \leq i < j \leq n). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In (4.5), we have introduced the function

$$(4.7) \quad {}_n Y_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) := \tilde{p}(\lambda_{i,j}) \cdot {}_n \tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) + p(\lambda_{i,j}) \cdot {}_n G_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n),$$

which is rational in  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *The properties (4.1)–(4.6) imply the reduced qKZ equation (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5) for  $h_n$ .*

*Proof.* Eqs.(4.1), (4.3) and (4.4) are equivalent to the corresponding set of relations for the rational functions  ${}_n \tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$  and  ${}_n G_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$ . Hence they hold true if we replace  ${}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$  by  ${}_n \Omega_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$ . The exchange symmetry (2.3) for  $h_n$  is obvious from this remark.

Let us consider (2.4). It follows from (2.12) and (4.2) that the definition (4.7) of  ${}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,j)}$  can be rewritten as

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & {}_n \Omega_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\lambda_1 - 1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ &= A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \left( {}_n \Omega_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) + {}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\phi_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) := -4 \sum_{j=2}^n {}_n \Omega_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}) + \mathbf{s}_n.$$

Then (4.8) and (4.5) imply that

$$(4.9) \quad \phi_n(\lambda_1 - 1, \dots, \lambda_n) = A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \phi_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n).$$

In the definition (3.9) of  $h_n$ , the sum is taken over sequences  $i_1, \dots, i_m, j_1, \dots, j_m$ . The commutativity (4.4) implies that

$$(4.10) \quad \Omega_{K,(1,j)} \circ \Omega_{K \setminus \{1,j\},(k,l)} = \Omega_{K,(k,l)} \circ \Omega_{K \setminus \{k,l\},(1,j)}.$$

Repeating this procedure, one can bring the index ‘1’ to the last position. Collecting terms containing ‘1’, we obtain

$$(4.11) \quad h_n = \sum_{m=0}^{[n/2]} \frac{(-1)^m}{2^{n-2m}} \sum \Omega_{K_1,(i_1,j_1)} \circ \Omega_{K_2,(i_2,j_2)} \circ \dots \circ \Omega_{K_m,(i_m,j_m)}(\phi_{n-2m}),$$

where the sum is taken by the same rule as in (3.9) except that  $i_l, j_l \neq 1$  ( $l = 1, \dots, m$ ). The reduced qKZ equation (2.4) for  $h_n$  is an immediate consequence of (4.11), (4.3), and (4.9).

Finally (2.5) is a simple consequence of the relation (4.6).  $\square$

### 5. PROPERTIES OF ${}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$

Let us study some simple properties of  ${}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$ .

The  $\mathbb{C}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}]$ -linear map

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta} : U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \otimes \mathbb{C}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}] \longrightarrow \lambda \mathbb{C}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}] \oplus \mathbb{C}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}]$$

is uniquely characterized by the following properties.

$$(5.1) \quad \mathrm{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta}(AB) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta}(BA),$$

$$(5.2) \quad \mathrm{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta}(A) = 0 \quad \text{if } A \text{ has non-zero weight,}$$

$$(5.3) \quad \mathrm{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta}(q^{mH}) = \begin{cases} \lambda & (m = 0), \\ \frac{\zeta^m - \zeta^{-m}}{q^m - q^{-m}} & (m \neq 0), \end{cases}$$

$$(5.4) \quad \mathrm{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta}(CA) = \frac{\zeta + \zeta^{-1}}{(q - q^{-1})^2} \mathrm{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta}(A),$$

where  $A, B \in U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ , and

$$C = \frac{q^{-1+H} + q^{1-H}}{(q - q^{-1})^2} + EF$$

is a central element. It follows that for any  $A \in U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{k+1, q^{k+1}}(A) = \mathrm{tr}_{V^{(k)}}(\pi^{(k)}(A)) \quad (k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}),$$

and

$$(5.5) \quad \mathrm{Tr}_{-\lambda, \zeta^{-1}}(A) = -\mathrm{Tr}_{\lambda, \zeta}(A).$$

For  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , we set

$$r^{(k,1)}(\lambda) := (\pi^{(k)} \otimes \mathrm{id})(L(\lambda)).$$

We have  $r^{(1,1)}(\lambda) = r(\lambda)$ . We will often use crossing symmetry

$$(5.6) \quad L_a(\lambda)s_{a,b} = -L_b(-\lambda - 1)s_{a,b}.$$

Since

$$L_1\left(\frac{\mu}{2}\right)L_2\left(\frac{\mu}{2} - 1\right)s_{1,2} = \left(\frac{q^\mu + q^{-\mu}}{(q - q^{-1})^2} - C\right)s_{1,2},$$

we have for any  $A \in U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$

$$(5.7) \quad \mathrm{Tr}_\lambda \left( AL_1\left(\frac{\mu}{2}\right)L_2\left(\frac{\mu}{2} - 1\right) \right) s_{1,2} = \left[\frac{\mu - \lambda}{2}\right] \left[\frac{\mu + \lambda}{2}\right] \mathrm{Tr}_\lambda(A) s_{1,2}.$$

Note that (5.7) implies that

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_\lambda \left( A \mathcal{P}_{1,2}^- L_2\left(\frac{\mu}{2} - 1\right) L_1\left(\frac{\mu}{2}\right) \right) &= \mathrm{Tr}_\lambda \left( A L_1\left(\frac{\mu}{2}\right) L_2\left(\frac{\mu}{2} - 1\right) \mathcal{P}_{1,2}^- \right) \\ &= \left[\frac{\mu - \lambda}{2}\right] \left[\frac{\mu + \lambda}{2}\right] \mathrm{Tr}_\lambda(A) \mathcal{P}_{1,2}^-. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 5.1.** *For each  $\epsilon_p, \epsilon'_p, \bar{\epsilon}_p, \bar{\epsilon}'_p \in \{1, -1\}$  ( $2 \leq p \leq n$ ), set  $l = \sum_{p=2}^n (\epsilon_p + \bar{\epsilon}_p)$ ,  $l' = \sum_{p=2}^n (\epsilon'_p + \bar{\epsilon}'_p)$ . Then as a function of  $\lambda_1$  we have*

$$(5.9) \quad \text{Tr}_{\lambda_{1,2}} \left( L\left(\frac{\lambda_{1,2}}{2} - 1\right)_{\bar{\epsilon}_2, \bar{\epsilon}'_2} L\left(\frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}{2} - \lambda_3 - 1\right)_{\bar{\epsilon}_3, \bar{\epsilon}'_3} \cdots L\left(\frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}{2} - \lambda_n - 1\right)_{\bar{\epsilon}_n, \bar{\epsilon}'_n} \right. \\ \left. \times L\left(\frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}{2} - \lambda_n\right)_{\epsilon_n, \epsilon'_n} \cdots L\left(\frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}{2} - \lambda_3\right)_{\epsilon_3, \epsilon'_3} L\left(\frac{\lambda_{1,2}}{2}\right)_{\epsilon_2, \epsilon'_2} \right) \\ = \begin{cases} \zeta_1^{-(n-1+|l|/2)} (\lambda_{1,2} \tilde{g}(\zeta_1^2) + g(\zeta_1^2)) & (l = l') \\ 0 & (l \neq l'), \end{cases}$$

where  $\tilde{g}(z), g(z)$  are polynomials of degree at most  $n - 1 + |l|/2$ .

*Proof.* Let us write  $\bar{\epsilon}_2, \dots, \bar{\epsilon}_n, \epsilon_n, \dots, \epsilon_2$  as  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{2n-2}$ . The expression inside the trace is a product of factors of the form  $\tilde{E}, \tilde{F}, \left[\frac{\lambda_{1,2} + \varepsilon_p H}{2} + c_p\right]$ , where  $c_p$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear combination of  $1/2, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ . The  $\text{Tr}$  has a non-zero value only when  $\tilde{E}$  and  $\tilde{F}$  occur the same number of times. Hence it is 0 if  $l \neq l'$ .

Consider the case  $l = l'$ . By the property (5.4) we have

$$EF \equiv \left[\frac{\lambda + 1 - H}{2}\right] \left[\frac{\lambda - 1 + H}{2}\right], \\ FE \equiv \left[\frac{\lambda + 1 + H}{2}\right] \left[\frac{\lambda - 1 - H}{2}\right],$$

where  $X \equiv X'$  means that  $\text{Tr}_\lambda(AX) = \text{Tr}_\lambda(AX')$  for all  $A \in U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ . Using them one can reduce (5.9) to a linear combination of terms of the form

$$\text{Tr}_{\lambda_{1,2}} \left( q^{(n-1)\lambda_{1,2} + (l/2)H - \sum_{p \in I} (\lambda_{1,2} + \varepsilon_p H)} \right) \\ = q^{(n-1)\lambda_{1,2} - \#I \cdot \lambda_{1,2}} \times \begin{cases} \frac{[(l/2 - \sum_{p \in I} \varepsilon_p) \lambda_{1,2}]}{[l/2 - \sum_{p \in I} \varepsilon_p]} & (\sum_{p \in I} \varepsilon_p \neq l/2), \\ \lambda_{1,2} & (\text{otherwise}), \end{cases}$$

where  $I$  is a subset of  $\{1, \dots, 2n-2\}$ . The last expression is a linear combination of  $\zeta_1^s$  or  $\lambda_{1,2} \zeta_1^s$ , with the possible power (note that  $l$  is even)

$$s = n - 1 \pm \frac{l}{2} - \sum_{p \in I} (1 \pm \varepsilon_p).$$

It is easy to see that  $s \equiv n - 1 + |l|/2 \pmod{2}$  and  $|s| \leq n - 1 + |l|/2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.2.** *The functions  ${}_n \tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(1,2)}$  has the parity property*

$$(5.10) \quad {}_n \tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(1,2)}(\zeta_1, \dots, -\zeta_j, \dots, \zeta_n) \\ = \sigma_j^z \sigma_j^z \cdot {}_n \tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(1,2)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_j, \dots, \zeta_n) \cdot \begin{cases} (-1)^{n-1} \prod_{p=1}^{n-2} (\sigma_p^z \sigma_p^z) & (j = 1, 2), \\ \sigma_{j-2}^z \sigma_{j-2}^z & (3 \leq j \leq n). \end{cases}$$

In particular, we have

$$(5.11) \quad {}_n \tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(1,2)}(\zeta_1, \dots, -\zeta_j, \dots, \zeta_n)(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}) = -\sigma_j^z \sigma_j^z \cdot {}_n \tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(1,2)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_j, \dots, \zeta_n)(\mathbf{s}_{n-2})$$

These relations hold also for  ${}_n G_{n-2}^{(1,2)}$  in place of  ${}_n \tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(1,2)}$ .

*Proof.* The case  $j \geq 3$  is a consequence of the relation

$$(5.12) \quad L(\lambda + 1/\nu) = -\sigma^z L(\lambda) \sigma^z.$$

For  $j = 1$ , (5.10) follows from Lemma 5.1 and

$$\prod_{p=1}^n \sigma_p^z \sigma_{\bar{p}}^z \cdot {}_n X_{n-2}^{(1,2)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = {}_n X_{n-2}^{(1,2)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \cdot \prod_{p=1}^{n-2} \sigma_p^z \sigma_{\bar{p}}^z.$$

Finally the case with  $j = 2$  follows from the translation invariance

$${}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1 + \mu, \dots, \lambda_n + \mu) = {}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$$

and the rest of (5.10) by simultaneously shifting  $\lambda_j$  by  $1/\nu$ .  $\square$

Define an operator acting on  $V^{\otimes 2n}$  by

$$(5.13) \quad t_{n,a}^{[1,\dots,k]}(\lambda; \lambda_{k+1}, \dots, \lambda_n) := R_{a,\bar{k}+1}(\lambda - \lambda_{k+1} - 1) \cdots R_{a,\bar{n}}(\lambda - \lambda_n - 1) \\ \times R_{a,n}(\lambda - \lambda_n) \cdots R_{a,k+1}(\lambda - \lambda_{k+1})$$

for  $a \in \{1, \dots, k, \bar{k}, \dots, \bar{1}\}$ . The following specializations are sometimes useful.

**Lemma 5.3.** *We have*

$$(5.14) \quad {}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \Big|_{\lambda_{i,j} = \pm 1} = 0,$$

$$(5.15) \quad {}_n X_{n-2}^{(1,2)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \Big|_{\lambda_{1,2} = -2} (u) = (-1)^{n-1} \frac{1}{[2]} r_{\bar{1},\bar{2}}(-2) \\ \times t_{n,\bar{1}}^{[1,2]}(\lambda_2 - 1; \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n) (s_{1,\bar{2}} s_{\bar{1},2} u_{3,\dots,n,\bar{n},\dots,\bar{3}}),$$

*Proof.* By the definition we have  $\text{Tr}_1(A) = \varepsilon(A)$ , where  $\varepsilon : U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  stands for the counit. Since

$$\varepsilon \left( T_n^{[i]} \left( \frac{\lambda_i + \lambda_j}{2} \right) \right)$$

is divisible by  $[\frac{\lambda_{i,j}+1}{2}][\frac{\lambda_{i,j}-1}{2}]$ , we obtain (5.14). Similarly (5.15) follows by noting  $\text{tr}_{V_a}(A_a r_{a,b}(0)) = A_b$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4.** *The coefficients of the linear map*

$$(5.16) \quad [\lambda_{i,j}] \prod_{p(\neq i,j)}^n [\lambda_{i,p}][\lambda_{j,p}] \cdot {}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$$

belong to  $\lambda_{i,j} \mathbb{C}[\zeta_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, \zeta_n^{\pm 1}] \oplus \mathbb{C}[\zeta_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, \zeta_n^{\pm 1}]$ . Moreover,  ${}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  does not have a pole at  $\lambda_{i,j} = 0$ .

*Proof.* The regularity at  $\lambda_{i,j} = 0$  is a consequence of the property (5.5).

Let  $\hat{X}$  denote the expression (5.16). We must show that the poles  $[\lambda_{i,p} \pm 1] = 0$  ( $1 \leq p \leq i-1$ ),  $[\lambda_{j,p} \pm 1] = 0$  ( $1 \leq p \leq j-1, p \neq i$ ) contained in the product of  $R$  matrices are spurious. We show  $\hat{X}$  is regular at  $[\lambda_{j,p} + 1] = 0$  with  $1 \leq p \leq i-1$  and  $[\lambda_{i,p} + 1] = 0$  with  $1 \leq p \leq i-1$ . The other cases can be treated in a similar manner.

Using the Yang-Baxter relation (3.5) we can move  $L_j$  to the right and bring it to the position next to  $L_p$ , so that  $\hat{X}$  becomes as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{X}(u) &= R_{i,i-1} \cdots R_{i,1} \cdot R_{j,j-1} \cdots \widehat{R_{j,i}} \cdots R_{j,p+1} \cdot R_{\overline{i-1},\bar{i}} \cdots R_{\bar{1},\bar{i}} \\ &\quad \times \text{Tr}_{\lambda_{i,j}} \left( L_{\bar{1}} \cdots \widehat{L_{\bar{i}}} \cdots L_{\bar{n}} \cdot L_n \cdots \widehat{L_j} \cdots \widehat{L_i} \cdots L_{p+1} \underline{L_j L_p R_{j,p} L_{p-1}} \cdots L_1 \right) \\ &\quad \times R_{j,p-1} \cdots R_{j,1} \cdot R_{\overline{j-1},\bar{j}} \cdots \widehat{R_{i,\bar{j}}} \cdots \underline{R_{\bar{p},\bar{j}}} \cdots R_{\bar{1},\bar{j}} (s_{i,\bar{j}} s_{i,j} u_{1,\dots,\hat{i},\dots,\hat{j},\dots,n,\bar{n},\dots,\hat{j},\dots,\hat{i},\dots,\bar{1}}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we have set  $L_{\bar{k}} = L_{\bar{k}}((\lambda_i + \lambda_j)/2 - \lambda_k - 1)$ ,  $L_k = L_k((\lambda_i + \lambda_j)/2 - \lambda_k)$ ,  $R_{k,l} = R_{k,l}(\lambda_{k,l})$  and  $R_{\bar{k},\bar{l}} = R_{\bar{k},\bar{l}}(\lambda_{k,l})$ . The possible pole at  $[\lambda_{j,p} + 1] = 0$  comes only from the underlined part,

$$L_j \left( \frac{\lambda_{i,j}}{2} \right) L_p \left( \frac{\lambda_{i,j}}{2} + \lambda_{j,p} \right) R_{j,p}(\lambda_{j,p}) \quad \text{and} \quad R_{\bar{p},\bar{j}}(\lambda_{p,j}).$$

Because of (5.8) and (5.12), the pole is in fact absent.

Likewise, we move  $L_{\bar{j}}$  to the left, and use cyclicity (5.1) and crossing symmetry (5.6) to change it to  $L_i$ . Bringing the latter further to the left, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\hat{X}(u) &= R_{i,i-1} \cdots R_{i,p+1} \cdot R_{\overline{i-1},\bar{i}} \cdots \underline{R_{\bar{p},\bar{i}}} \cdots R_{\bar{1},\bar{i}} \cdot R_{\overline{j-1},\bar{j}} \cdots \widehat{R_{i,\bar{j}}} \cdots R_{\bar{1},\bar{j}} \\ &\quad \times \text{Tr}_{\lambda_{i,j}} \left( L_{\bar{1}} \cdots \widehat{L_{\bar{i}}} \cdots \widehat{L_{\bar{j}}} \cdots L_{\bar{n}} \cdot L_n \cdots \widehat{L_i} \cdots L_{p+1} \underline{L_i L_p R_{i,p} L_{p-1}} \cdots L_1 \right) \\ &\quad \times R_{i,p-1} \cdots R_{i,1} \cdot R_{j,j-1} \cdots \widehat{R_{j,i}} \cdots R_{j,1} (s_{i,\bar{j}} s_{i,j} u_{1,\dots,\hat{i},\dots,\hat{j},\dots,n,\bar{n},\dots,\hat{j},\dots,\hat{i},\dots,\bar{1}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the underlined part is

$$R_{\bar{p},\bar{i}}(\lambda_{p,i}) \quad \text{and} \quad L_i \left( \frac{\lambda_{j,i}}{2} \right) L_p \left( \frac{\lambda_{j,i}}{2} + \lambda_{i,p} \right) R_{i,p}(\lambda_{i,p}).$$

Hence  $[\lambda_{i,p} + 1] = 0$  is not a pole for the same reason as above.  $\square$

## 6. PROOF OF EXCHANGE RELATION

Let us verify the exchange relation.

In the case  $(i, j) = (k, k+1) = (1, 2)$ , (4.1) is derived by noting the Yang-Baxter relation

$$(6.1) \quad \check{R}_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2}) L_2(\lambda - \lambda_2) L_1(\lambda - \lambda_1) = L_2(\lambda - \lambda_1) L_1(\lambda - \lambda_2) \check{R}_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2})$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} &\check{R}_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2}) \check{R}_{2,\bar{1}}(\lambda_{2,1}) L_2 \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,2}}{2} \right) L_{\bar{2}} \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,2}}{2} - 1 \right) s_{1,\bar{2}} s_{\bar{1},2} \\ &= -\check{R}_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2}) \check{R}_{2,\bar{1}}(\lambda_{2,1}) L_2 \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,2}}{2} \right) L_1 \left( \frac{\lambda_{2,1}}{2} \right) s_{1,\bar{2}} s_{\bar{1},2} \\ &= -L_2 \left( \frac{\lambda_{2,1}}{2} \right) L_1 \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,2}}{2} \right) \check{R}_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2}) \check{R}_{2,\bar{1}}(\lambda_{2,1}) s_{1,\bar{2}} s_{\bar{1},2} \\ &= L_2 \left( \frac{\lambda_{2,1}}{2} \right) L_{\bar{2}} \left( \frac{\lambda_{2,1}}{2} - 1 \right) s_{1,\bar{2}} s_{\bar{1},2}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line we used the unitarity

$$R_{a,b}(\lambda) R_{b,a}(-\lambda) = \text{id}$$

and crossing symmetry

$$R_{a,b}(\lambda)s_{a,c} = -R_{b,c}(-\lambda - 1)s_{a,c}$$

for the  $R$  matrix.

The rest of the assertion is an easy consequence of the Yang-Baxter relation (6.1).

## 7. PROOF OF THE FIRST DIFFERENCE EQUATION

In this section we prove (4.2) and (4.3). We note that the symmetry

$$\begin{aligned} A_n^{(1)}(\cdots, \lambda_{j+1}, \lambda_j, \cdots) \check{R}_{j,j+1}(\lambda_{j,j+1}) \check{R}_{\overline{j+1}, \overline{j}}(\lambda_{j+1,j}) \\ = \check{R}_{j,j+1}(\lambda_{j,j+1}) \check{R}_{\overline{j+1}, \overline{j}}(\lambda_{j+1,j}) A_n^{(1)}(\cdots, \lambda_j, \lambda_{j+1}, \cdots) \quad (j \geq 2) \end{aligned}$$

allows us to restrict to  $j = 2$  for (4.2), and to  $(i, j) = (2, 3)$  for (4.3) without loss of generality.

Observe also that the relations (4.1)–(4.6) are equalities between rational functions in  $\zeta_j$ . It is enough if we prove them when one of the parameter differences  $\lambda_{i,j}$  is a sufficiently large integer, because of the following Lemma.

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $q$  be a non-zero complex number such that  $q^n \neq 1$  for any positive integer  $n$ , and let  $f(\lambda, \zeta) \in \mathbb{C}[\lambda, \zeta]$ . If  $f(k, q^k) = 0$  for any integer  $k > N$  for some  $N$ , then  $f(\lambda, \zeta) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $f(\lambda, \zeta) = \sum_{m=0}^M f_m(\zeta) \lambda^m$ ,  $f_m(\zeta) \in \mathbb{C}[\zeta]$ . We show  $f = 0$  by induction on  $M$  and  $\deg f_M$ . The case  $M = 0$  is obvious. Suppose the assertion is proved for smaller values of  $M$ , or the same  $M$  with  $\deg f_M < l$ . Let us prove the case  $\deg f_M \leq l$ . Consider  $\tilde{f}(\lambda, \zeta) = f(\lambda + 1, q\zeta) - q^l f(\lambda, \zeta)$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have  $\tilde{f} = 0$ . Let  $T$  be the linear map on  $W = \bigoplus_{m=0}^M \bigoplus_{n=0}^N \mathbb{C} \lambda^m \zeta^n$  ( $N = \max \deg f_m$ ) given by  $(Tg)(\lambda, \zeta) = g(\lambda + 1, q\zeta)$ . We have then  $Tf = q^l f$ . Since  $q$  is not a root of unity,  $W$  is a direct sum of generalized eigenspaces  $W_s = \bigoplus_{m=0}^M \mathbb{C} \lambda^m \zeta^s$  of  $T$  with the eigenvalue  $q^s$  ( $0 \leq s \leq N$ ). Each eigenspace is one-dimensional because  $T|_{W_s}$  is represented by a matrix with one Jordan block. Hence  $Tf = q^l f$  implies  $f = a\zeta^l$  with some  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ . It is then clear that  $f = 0$ .  $\square$

We prove (4.2) for  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$ , assuming  $\lambda_{2,1} = k + 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ .

We use an auxiliary space  $V_a^{(k)}$  of dimension  $k + 1$  and set

$$\pi_a^{(k)} = \pi^{(k)} \otimes \text{id}_{V^{\otimes 2n}} : U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \otimes \text{End}(V^{\otimes 2n}) \longrightarrow \text{End}(V_a^{(k)}) \otimes \text{End}(V^{\otimes 2n}).$$

Since

$$-\prod_{p=2}^n [\lambda_{1,p} - 1][\lambda_{1,p} + 1] \cdot A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) = \text{tr}_{V_a^{(1)}} \left( \pi_a^{(1)}(T_n^{[1]}(\lambda_1)) P_{a, \bar{1}} \right) P_{1, \bar{1}},$$

the identity to be proved reads

$$\begin{aligned} (7.1) \quad & \prod_{p=2}^n [\lambda_{2,p} - k - 1][\lambda_{2,p} - k] \cdot \text{tr}_{V_c^{(k+1)}} \left( \pi_c^{(k+1)}(T_n^{[1]}(\lambda_2 - \frac{k+2}{2})) \right) s_{1, \bar{2}} s_{\bar{1}, 2} \\ & = \text{tr}_{V_a^{(1)}} \left( \pi_a^{(1)}(T_n^{[1]}(\lambda_2 - k - 1)) P_{a, \bar{1}} \right) P_{1, \bar{1}} \text{tr}_{V_b^{(k)}} \left( \pi_b^{(k)}(T_n^{[1]}(\lambda_2 - \frac{k+1}{2})) \right) s_{1, \bar{2}} s_{\bar{1}, 2}. \end{aligned}$$

First, we show that the operator  $P_{1,\bar{1}}$  can be replaced by 1. Since  $P_{1,\bar{1}} = 1 + r_{1,\bar{1}}(-1)$ , it is enough to show that

$$(7.2) \quad r_{1,\bar{1}}(-1) \text{tr}_{V_b^{(k)}} \left( \pi_b^{(k)} \left( T_n^{[1]} \left( \lambda_2 - \frac{k+1}{2} \right) \right) \right) s_{1,\bar{2}} s_{\bar{1},2} = 0.$$

By using crossing symmetry (see (5.6)) and cyclicity of the trace (5.1), we see that the above expression contains

$$r_{b,2}^{(k,1)} \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,2}}{2} \right) r_{b,\bar{2}}^{(k,1)} \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,2}}{2} - 1 \right) r_{2,\bar{2}}(-1)$$

inside the trace. Then, using (5.7), we obtain (7.2).

Rewrite the right hand side of (7.1) as

$$\text{tr}_{V_a^{(1)} \otimes V_b^{(k)}} (AB) s_{1,\bar{2}} s_{\bar{1},2} = \text{tr}_{V_a^{(1)} \otimes V_b^{(k)}} (BA) s_{1,\bar{2}} s_{\bar{1},2},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= r_{a,\bar{2}}(-k-2) r_{b,\bar{2}}^{(k,1)} \left( -\frac{k+3}{2} \right) \pi_a^{(1)} (T_n^{[1,2]}(\lambda_2 - k - 1)) \pi_b^{(k)} (T_n^{[1,2]}(\lambda_2 - \frac{k+1}{2})), \\ B &= r_{a,2}(-k-1) r_{b,2}^{(k,1)} \left( -\frac{k+1}{2} \right) P_{a,\bar{1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used

$$T_n^{[1,2]}(\lambda) = L_{\bar{3}}(\lambda - \lambda_3 - 1) \cdots L_{\bar{n}}(\lambda - \lambda_n - 1) L_n(\lambda - \lambda_n) \cdots L_3(\lambda - \lambda_3).$$

The space  $V^{(k)}$  can be identified with the subspace of  $V^{\otimes k}$  consisting of completely symmetric tensors,

$$(7.3) \quad V^{(k)} \simeq \bigcap_{i=1}^{k-1} \text{Ker } r_{b_{i+1}, b_i}(-1) \subset V_{b_k}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes V_{b_1}^{(1)},$$

and the operator  $r_{b,2}^{(k,1)}(\lambda)$  acting on  $V_b^{(k)} \otimes V_2^{(1)}$  is identified as

$$r_{b,2}^{(k,1)}(\lambda) \prod_{j=0}^{k-2} \left[ \lambda + \frac{k-1}{2} - j \right] = r_{b_k,2}(\lambda - \frac{k-1}{2}) \cdots r_{b_1,2}(\lambda + \frac{k-1}{2}).$$

The factor in the left hand side is non-zero for  $\lambda = \lambda_{1,2}/2 = -(k+1)/2$ . Let us show

$$B(V^{(1)} \otimes V^{(k)}) \subset V^{(k+1)}.$$

It suffices to check that

$$r_{a,b_k}(-1) B s_{\bar{1},2} = 0.$$

Let us prove it. From the Yang-Baxter equation we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{a,b_k}(-1) B s_{\bar{1},2} &= r_{b_k,2}(-k) r_{a,2}(-k-1) r_{b_{k-1},2}(-k+1) \cdots r_{b_2,2}(-2) \\ &\times r_{a,b_k}(-1) r_{b_1,2}(-1) P_{a,\bar{1}} s_{\bar{1},2}. \end{aligned}$$

By using crossing symmetry repeatedly, we find

$$\begin{aligned} r_{b_1,2}(-1)P_{a,\bar{1}}s_{\bar{1},2} &= r_{b_1,2}(-1)r_{a,\bar{1}}(0)s_{\bar{1},2} \\ &= -r_{b_1,2}(-1)r_{2,a}(-1)s_{\bar{1},2} = r_{a,b_1}(0)r_{2,a}(-1)s_{\bar{1},2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} r_{a,b_k}(-1)r_{b_1,2}(-1)P_{a,\bar{1}}s_{\bar{1},2} &= r_{a,b_k}(-1)r_{a,b_1}(0)r_{2,a}(-1)s_{\bar{1},2} \\ &= r_{a,b_1}(0)r_{b_1,b_k}(-1)r_{2,a}(-1)s_{\bar{1},2}. \end{aligned}$$

This acts as 0 on  $V^{(1)} \otimes V^{(k)}$ .

Therefore the trace of  $BA$  is unchanged if we replace  $V^{(1)} \otimes V^{(k)}$  by  $V^{(k+1)}$ . Using crossing symmetry we rewrite the right hand side of (7.1) as

$$(7.4) \quad \text{tr}_{V^{(k+1)}}(BA)_{s_{1,\bar{2}}s_{\bar{1},2}} = -\text{tr}_{V^{(k+1)}}\left(Ar_{a,2}(-k-1)P_{a,\bar{1}}r_{b,\bar{1}}^{(k,1)}\left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right)\right)_{s_{1,\bar{2}}s_{\bar{1},2}}.$$

The space  $V^{(k+1)}$  can also be identified with  $\text{Im } r_{b,a}^{(k,1)}\left(\frac{k+1}{2}\right) \subset V^{(k)} \otimes V^{(1)}$ . On the other hand, (5.7) implies that

$$\mathcal{P}_{a,\bar{1}}^- r_{b,\bar{1}}^{(k,1)}\left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right)r_{b,a}^{(k,1)}\left(\frac{k+1}{2}\right) = 0$$

holds on  $V^{(k)} \otimes V^{(1)}$ . Hence in the right hand side of (7.4) one can drop  $P_{a,\bar{1}}$ .

Using the fusion relation

$$r_{b,a}^{(1,1)}\left(\lambda - \frac{k}{2}\right)r_{(b_1,\dots,b_k),a}^{(k,1)}\left(\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\right)\Big|_{V^{(k+1)}} = \left[\lambda - \frac{k}{2} + 1\right] \cdot r_{(b,b_1,\dots,b_k),a}^{(k+1,1)}(\lambda),$$

we obtain (7.1).

## 8. PROOF OF THE SECOND DIFFERENCE EQUATION

We prove (4.3) with  $(i,j) = (2,3)$  and  $k = 1$ . Other cases follow from (4.1) and the following equalities.

$$\begin{aligned} &A_n^{(j)}(\dots, \lambda_{k+1}, \lambda_k, \dots)\check{R}_{k,k+1}(\lambda_{k,k+1})\check{R}_{k+1,\bar{k}}(\lambda_{k+1,k}) \\ &= \begin{cases} \check{R}_{k,k+1}(\lambda_{k,k+1})\check{R}_{k+1,\bar{k}}(\lambda_{k+1,k})A_n^{(j)}(\dots, \lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1}, \dots) & \text{if } j \neq k, k+1; \\ \check{R}_{k,k+1}(\lambda_{k,k+1}-1)\check{R}_{k+1,\bar{k}}(\lambda_{k+1,k}+1)A_n^{(k)}(\dots, \lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1}, \dots) & \text{if } j = k+1; \\ \check{R}_{k,k+1}(\lambda_{k,k+1}+1)\check{R}_{k+1,\bar{k}}(\lambda_{k+1,k}-1)A_n^{(k+1)}(\dots, \lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1}, \dots) & \text{if } j = k. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The relation to be shown reads as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (8.1) \quad &{}_nX_{n-2}^{(2,3)}(\lambda_1-1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)t_{n-2,\bar{1}}^{[1]}(\lambda_1; \lambda_4, \dots, \lambda_n)P_{1,\bar{1}} \\ &= R_{\bar{1},\bar{2}}(\lambda_{1,2}-1)R_{\bar{1},\bar{3}}(\lambda_{1,3}-1)t_{n,\bar{1}}^{[1,2,3]}(\lambda_1; \lambda_4, \dots, \lambda_n)R_{\bar{1},3}(\lambda_{1,3})R_{\bar{1},2}(\lambda_{1,2})P_{1,\bar{1}} \\ &\quad \times {}_nX_{n-2}^{(2,3)}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $t_{n-2,\bar{1}}^{[1]}$  and  $t_{n,\bar{1}}^{[1,2,3]}$  are given in (5.13).

From (4.2), we have

$${}_nX_{n-2}^{(2,3)}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2-1, \dots, \lambda_n) = -A_n^{(2)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_nX_{n-2}^{(2,3)}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n).$$

Let  $Z(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  denote the left hand side minus the right hand side of (8.1). Then

$$Z(\lambda_1, \lambda_2 - 1, \dots, \lambda_n) = -A_n^{(2)}(\lambda_1 - 1, \dots, \lambda_n)Z(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n).$$

The matrix  $A_n^{(2)}(\lambda_1 - 1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  does not have a pole at  $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 - k$  with  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $k \geq 2$ . To show  $Z = 0$ , it is therefore enough to check it for  $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 - 2$ .

The verification is straightforward with the aid of

$$\begin{aligned} (8.2) \quad & {}_n X_{n-2}^{(2,3)}(\lambda_1, \lambda_3 - 2, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n)(u) \\ &= (-1)^n \frac{1}{[2]} r_{\bar{2}, \bar{3}}(-2) R_{2,1}(\lambda_{3,1} - 2) R_{\bar{1}, \bar{3}}(\lambda_{1,3}) \\ &\quad \times t_{n, \bar{2}}^{[1,2,3]}(\lambda_3 - 1; \lambda_4, \dots, \lambda_n)(s_{2, \bar{3}} s_{\bar{2}, 3} u_{1,4,\dots,n,\bar{n},\dots,\bar{4}, \bar{1}}). \end{aligned}$$

## 9. PROOF OF COMMUTATIVITY

From the exchange relation (4.1) it suffices to prove the case of  $(i, j, k, l) = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ . Let  $Z'(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  stand for the difference between the left hand side and the right hand side of (4.4). From (4.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z'(\lambda_1 - 1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) &= -A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) Z'(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n), \\ Z'(\dots, \lambda_3 - 1, \dots) &= -A_n^{(3)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) Z'(\dots, \lambda_3, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

Both  $A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ ,  $A_n^{(3)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  do not have poles at  $\lambda_{1,2} = -k$  nor  $\lambda_{3,4} = -k$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $k \geq 2$ . Therefore, in order to show  $Z' = 0$ , it suffices to verify this when  $\lambda_{1,2} = \lambda_{3,4} = -2$ . In this case, a lengthy but direct verification using (5.15) shows that both sides of (4.4) are equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{[2]^2} r_{\bar{1}, \bar{2}}(-2) r_{\bar{3}, \bar{4}}(-2) R_{\bar{1}, \bar{4}}(\lambda_{2,4} - 2) t_{n, \bar{3}}^{[1,2,3,4]}(\lambda_4 - 1; \lambda_5, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ & \quad \times t_{n, \bar{1}}^{[1,2,3,4]}(\lambda_2 - 1; \lambda_5, \dots, \lambda_n) R_{\bar{1}, 3}(\lambda_{2,4} + 1) s_{1, \bar{2}} s_{\bar{1}, 2} s_{3, \bar{4}} s_{\bar{3}, 4}. \end{aligned}$$

## 10. PROOF OF CANCELLATION IDENTITY

In this subsection, for  $u \in V^{\otimes 2(n-1)}$  we abbreviate  $u_{1,\dots,n-1,\overline{n-1},\dots,\bar{1}} s_{n,\bar{n}}$  to  $u \cdot s_{n,\bar{n}}$ . Likewise for  $u \in V^{\otimes 2(n-2)}$  we abbreviate  $u_{1,\dots,n-2,\overline{n-2},\dots,\bar{1}} s_{n-1,\overline{n-1}} s_{n,\bar{n}}$  to  $u \cdot s_{n-1,\overline{n-1}} s_{n,\bar{n}}$ . We set

$$\begin{aligned} & Q_n(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \\ &:= 4 \sum_{j=2}^n {}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}) - (A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1} - 1) \mathbf{s}_n. \end{aligned}$$

This is a rational function in  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n$ . The following properties are easy to establish.

$$(10.1) \quad Q_n(\zeta_1/\xi, \dots, \zeta_n/\xi) = Q_n(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \quad (\text{for any } \xi \in \mathbb{C}^\times),$$

$$(10.2) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \sigma_j^z + \sigma_{\bar{j}}^z \right) Q_n(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) = 0,$$

$$(10.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & P_{j,j+1} \overline{r_{j,j+1}} (\lambda_{j,j+1}) Q_n(\dots, \zeta_{j+1}, \zeta_j, \dots) \\ &= P_{j,j+1} r_{j,j+1} (\lambda_{j,j+1}) Q_n(\dots, \zeta_j, \zeta_{j+1}, \dots) \quad (2 \leq j \leq n-1), \end{aligned}$$

$$(10.4) \quad Q_n(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-1}, -\zeta_n) = -\sigma_n^z \sigma_{\bar{n}}^z Q_n(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-1}, \zeta_n).$$

Eq. (10.2) follows from (5.2). Eq. (10.3) follows from (7.1), (4.1) and

$$(10.5) \quad \check{R}_{12}(\lambda) \check{R}_{2,\bar{1}}(-\lambda) s_{1\bar{1}} s_{2\bar{2}} = s_{1\bar{1}} s_{2\bar{2}}.$$

Eq. (10.4) follows from Lemma 5.2.

**Lemma 10.1.** As  $\zeta_n^{\pm 1} \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$Q_n(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) = Q_{n-1}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-1}) \cdot s_{n,\bar{n}} + O(\zeta_n^{\mp 1}).$$

*Proof.* Let us estimate the behavior of the difference

$$(10.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & Q_n(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) - Q_{n-1}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-1}) \cdot s_{n,\bar{n}} \\ &= {}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,n)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}) \\ &+ 4 \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \left( {}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}) - {}_{n-1} Y_{n-3}^{(1,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-1})(\mathbf{s}_{n-3}) \cdot s_{n,\bar{n}} \right) \\ &- A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_n) + A_{n-1}^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1})^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_{n-1}) \cdot s_{n,\bar{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the behavior of the first term when  $\zeta_n^{\pm 1} \rightarrow \infty$ . It is easy to estimate  $A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1} \mathbf{s}_n$ . For  ${}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,n)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)(\mathbf{s}_{n-2})$ , we move  $\lambda_n$  to the left end by using (4.1). The matrices  $R_{n,j}(\lambda_{n,j}) R_{j,\bar{n}}(\lambda_{j,n})$  are regular, while  $\check{p}(\lambda_{1,n}), p(\lambda_{1,n})$  behaves as  $O(\zeta_n^{\mp 2})$ . We apply Lemma 5.1. Because of the presence of  $s_{1,\bar{2}} s_{\bar{1},2} \mathbf{s}_{n-2}$ , in the notation of Lemma 5.1 we have  $\sum_{p=1}^n (\epsilon'_p + \bar{\epsilon}'_p) = 0$ . Therefore, from  $l = l'$  we obtain  $l = -(\epsilon_1 + \bar{\epsilon}'_1)$  and  $|l| \leq 2$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} & {}_n \tilde{G}_{n-2}^{(1,2)}(\zeta_n, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-1})(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}) = O(\zeta_n^{\pm 1}), \\ & {}_n G_{n-2}^{(1,2)}(\zeta_n, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-1})(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}) = O(\zeta_n^{\pm 1}). \end{aligned}$$

For the  $j$ -th term of the second sum, we have inside the trace

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{1}{[\lambda_{1,n}][\lambda_{j,n}]} L_{\bar{n}} \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,n} + \lambda_{j,n}}{2} - 1 \right) L_n \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,n} + \lambda_{j,n}}{2} \right) - 1 \right) s_{n,\bar{n}} \\ &= \left( -\frac{1}{[\lambda_{1,n}][\lambda_{j,n}]} L_{\bar{n}} \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,n} + \lambda_{j,n}}{2} - 1 \right) L_{\bar{n}} \left( -\frac{\lambda_{1,n} + \lambda_{j,n}}{2} - 1 \right) - 1 \right) s_{n,\bar{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the formula (3.1) of  $L$ , we see that this expression behaves as  $O(\zeta_n^{\mp 1})$  as  $\zeta_n^{\pm 1} \rightarrow \infty$ . Likewise the third term of (10.6) has the same behavior.

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 10.2.** *The function  $\prod_{j=2}^n [\lambda_{1,j}] \cdot Q_n(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)$  belongs to  $\mathbb{C}[\zeta_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, \zeta_n^{\pm 1}]$ .*

*Proof.* The only possible poles are where one of the following factors vanish:  $[\lambda_{1,j}]$ ,  $[\lambda_{1,j} \pm 1]$ ,  $[\lambda_{1,j} - 2]$  ( $2 \leq j \leq n$ ),  $[\lambda_{i,j}]$  ( $2 \leq i < j \leq n$ ). In view of the parity property (10.4), it is enough to show that  $\lambda_{1,j} \pm 1 = 0$ ,  $\lambda_{1,j} - 2 = 0$  and  $\lambda_{i,j} = 0$  are not poles.

At  $\lambda_{1,j} = \pm 1$ , only  ${}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,j)}$  can have a pole. Since

$$\text{res}_{\lambda=\pm 1} \tilde{p}(\lambda) = \mp \text{res}_{\lambda=\pm 1} p(\lambda),$$

we have by Lemma 5.3

$$\begin{aligned} \text{res}_{\lambda_{1,j}=\pm 1} \left( {}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \right) &= \text{const} \times {}_n X_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \Big|_{\lambda_{1,j}=\pm 1} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last line follows from Lemma 5.4.

At  $\lambda_{i,j} = 0$  ( $2 \leq i < j \leq n$ ), the contributing terms are  ${}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,i)}(\mathbf{s}_{n-2})$  and  ${}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\mathbf{s}_{n-2})$ . It is enough to compare  ${}_n X_{n-2}^{(1,i)}(\mathbf{s}_{n-2})$  and  ${}_n X_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\mathbf{s}_{n-2})$ . It is easy to check that their residues cancel each other by using  $P_{i+1,i} r_{i+1,i}(0) = 1$ , (6.1) and (10.5).

Consider  $\lambda_{1,j} = 2$ . Using

$$[\lambda - 2] \tilde{p}(\lambda) \Big|_{\lambda=2} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad [\lambda - 2] p(\lambda) \Big|_{\lambda=2} = -\frac{1}{4},$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{p=2}^n [\lambda_{1,p}] [\lambda_{1,p} - 2] \cdot 4 {}_n Y_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \Big|_{\lambda_{1,j}=2}(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}) \\ &= -[2] \prod_{\substack{p=2 \\ p \neq j}}^n [\lambda_{j,p} + 2] [\lambda_{j,p}] \cdot {}_n X_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \Big|_{\lambda_{1,j}=2}(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}) \\ &= -R_{j,j-1}(\lambda_{j,j-1}) \cdots R_{j,2}(\lambda_{j,2}) R_{\overline{j-1},\overline{j}}(\lambda_{j-1,j}) \cdots R_{\overline{2},\overline{j}}(\lambda_{2,j}) \\ &\times \text{Tr}_2 \left( L_{\overline{j}}(0) T_n^{[1,j]}(\lambda_1 - 1) L_j(1) \right) s_{1,\overline{j}} s_{\overline{1},j} \prod_{p(\neq 1,j)} s_{p,\overline{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_n^{[1,j]}(\lambda_1 - 1) &= L_{\overline{2}}(\lambda_{1,2} - 2) \cdots L_{\overline{j}}(\widehat{\lambda_{1,j} - 2}) \cdots L_{\overline{n}}(\lambda_{1,n} - 2) \\ &\times L_n(\lambda_{1,n} - 1) \cdots L_j(\widehat{\lambda_{1,j} - 1}) \cdots L_2(\lambda_{1,2} - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Under the  $\text{Tr}_2$ , this expression becomes

$$\begin{aligned} (10.7) \quad &(-1)^j r_{2,1}(\lambda_{2,1}) \cdots r_{n,1}(\lambda_{n,1}) r_{\overline{n},1}(\lambda_{n,1} + 1) \cdots r_{\overline{j+1},1}(\lambda_{j+1,1} + 1) \\ &\times r_{\overline{1},2}(\lambda_{j,2}) \cdots r_{\overline{1},\overline{j-1}}(\lambda_{j,j-1}) s_{1,\overline{j}} s_{\overline{1},j} \prod_{p(\neq 1,j)} s_{p,\overline{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting

$$-s_{1,\overline{j}} s_{\overline{1},j} = r_{\overline{j},1}(-1) s_{1,\overline{1}} s_{j,\overline{j}}$$

the last line is rewritten as

$$(-1)^{j-1} r_{j,1}^{-1}(\lambda_{j,1} + 1) r_{j-1,1}^{-1}(\lambda_{j-1,1} + 1) \cdots r_{2,1}^{-1}(\lambda_{2,1} + 1) \prod_{p=1}^n s_{p,\bar{p}}.$$

Hence (10.7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{p=2}^n [\lambda_{1,p}] [\lambda_{1,p} - 2] \cdot A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_n) \Big|_{\lambda_{1,j}=2} \\ &= -r_{2,1}(\lambda_{2,1}) \cdots r_{n,1}(\lambda_{n,1}) r_{\bar{n},1}(\lambda_{n,1} + 1) \cdots r_{2,1}^{-1}(\lambda_{2,1} + 1) \mathbf{s}_n \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 10.3.**

$$\mathcal{P}_{n-1,\bar{n}}^- Q_n(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-1}, q^{-1}\zeta_{n-1}) = \mathcal{P}_{n-1,\bar{n}}^- (Q_{n-2}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-2}) \cdot s_{n-1,\overline{n-1}} s_{n,\bar{n}}).$$

*Proof.* Consider

$$(10.8) \quad \mathcal{P}_{n-1,\bar{n}}^- \circ {}_n X_{n-2}^{(1,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}).$$

For  $2 \leq j \leq n-2$ , we have inside the trace the combination

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{P}_{n-1,\bar{n}}^- L_{n-1} \left( \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_j}{2} - \lambda_{n-1} - 1 \right) L_{\bar{n}} \left( \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_j}{2} - \lambda_n - 1 \right) \\ & \times L_n \left( \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_j}{2} - \lambda_n \right) L_{n-1} \left( \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_j}{2} - \lambda_{n-1} \right) (s_{n-1,\overline{n-1}} s_{n,\bar{n}}). \end{aligned}$$

From (5.8) and  $\mathcal{P}_{n-1,\bar{n}}^- s_{n-1,\overline{n-1}} s_{n,\bar{n}} = \mathcal{P}_{n-1,n}^- s_{n-1,\overline{n-1}} s_{n,\bar{n}}$ , this expression when specialized to  $\lambda_n = \lambda_{n-1} - 1$  reduces to

$$[\lambda_{1,n-1}] [\lambda_{j,n-1}] [\lambda_{1,n-1} + 1] [\lambda_{j,n-1} + 1] \mathcal{P}_{n-1,n}^- (s_{n-1,\overline{n-1}} s_{n,\bar{n}}).$$

Hence (10.8) becomes

$$\mathcal{P}_{n-1,\bar{n}}^- \left( {}_{n-2} X_{n-4}^{(1,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-2})(\mathbf{s}_{n-4}) \cdot s_{n-1,\overline{n-1}} s_{n,\bar{n}} \right) \quad (2 \leq j \leq n-2).$$

Let us show that (10.8) vanishes for  $j = n-1, n$ . For  $j = n-1$ , this is due to the factor

$$\mathcal{P}_{n-1,\bar{n}}^- L_{n-1} \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,n-1}}{2} - 1 \right) L_{\bar{n}} \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,n-1}}{2} \right)$$

inside the trace  $\text{Tr}_{\lambda_{1,n-1}}$ .

In the case  $j = n$ , we have inside  $\text{Tr}_{\lambda_{1,n}}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{P}_{n-1,\bar{n}}^- L_{n-1} \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,n}}{2} + \lambda_{n,n-1} - 1 \right) L_{\bar{n}} \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,n}}{2} - 1 \right) \frac{r_{n-1,\bar{n}}(\lambda_{n-1,n})}{[\lambda_{n-1,n} + 1]} \\ & \times L_n \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,n}}{2} \right) L_{n-1} \left( \frac{\lambda_{1,n}}{2} + \lambda_{n,n-1} \right) \frac{r_{n,n-1}(\lambda_{n,n-1})}{[\lambda_{n,n-1} + 1]}. \end{aligned}$$

At  $\lambda_{n-1} = \lambda_n + 1$ , the first product vanishes and the second product is regular.

By a similar calculation we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{P}_{n-1, \bar{n}}^- A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_n) \Big|_{\lambda_n = \lambda_{n-1} - 1} \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{n-1, \bar{n}}^- \left( A_{n-2}^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-2})^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_{n-2}) \cdot s_{n-1, \overline{n-1}} s_{n, \bar{n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The assertion follows from these.  $\square$

Let us now prove (4.5).

Lemma 10.2 implies that

$$u_n = \prod_{j=2}^n (\zeta_j / \zeta_1 - \zeta_1 / \zeta_j) \cdot Q_n(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)$$

has no poles in  $\zeta_j \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ , ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ). It is evident that  $Q_0 = Q_1 = 0$ . Suppose  $n \geq 2$ , and assume by induction that  $Q_{n-2} = Q_{n-1} = 0$ . It follows from (10.3) and Lemma 10.1 that  $u_n$  is regular at  $\zeta_j^{\pm 1} \rightarrow \infty$  for  $j = 2, \dots, n$ . Along with (10.1), we conclude that  $u_n$  is independent of  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n$ .

It is convenient to pass from vectors in  $V^{\otimes 2n}$  to matrices via the isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\otimes 2n} &\xrightarrow{\sim} \text{End}(V^{\otimes n}), \\ v_{\epsilon_1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{\epsilon_n} \otimes v_{\bar{\epsilon}_n} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{\bar{\epsilon}_1} &\mapsto \prod_{p=1}^n (-\bar{\epsilon}_p) \cdot E_{\epsilon_1, -\bar{\epsilon}_1} \otimes \dots \otimes E_{\epsilon_n, -\bar{\epsilon}_n}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $E_{\epsilon, \bar{\epsilon}} = (\delta_{\epsilon, a} \delta_{\bar{\epsilon}, b})_{a, b}$  denotes the matrix unit. It induces the mapping  $\text{End}(V^{\otimes 2n}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{End}(\text{End}(V^{\otimes n}))$ . In particular,  $(E_{\epsilon, \epsilon'})_j$  in the former corresponds to the left multiplication by  $(E_{\epsilon, \epsilon'})_j$  in the latter, and  $(E_{\epsilon, \epsilon'})_{\bar{j}}$  in the former to the right multiplication by

$$\begin{cases} (E_{\mp, \mp})_j & \text{if } (\epsilon, \epsilon') = (\pm, \pm); \\ -(E_{\pm, \mp})_j & \text{if } (\epsilon, \epsilon') = (\pm, \mp). \end{cases}$$

in the latter.

Let  $U_n \in \text{End}(V^{\otimes n})$  denote the constant matrix corresponding to the constant vector  $u_n$ . The properties (10.2), (10.3), (10.4) of  $Q_n$ , Lemma 10.3 and the assumption of the induction imply the following for  $U_n$ :

$$(10.9) \quad \left[ \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j^z, U_n \right] = 0,$$

$$(10.10) \quad [P_{j, j+1} r_{j, j+1}(\lambda_{j, j+1}), U_n] = 0 \quad (2 \leq j \leq n-1),$$

$$(10.11) \quad \sigma_n^z U_n + U_n \sigma_n^z = 0,$$

$$(10.12) \quad U_n \mathcal{P}_{n-1, n}^- = 0.$$

Letting  $\zeta_j^{\pm 1} \rightarrow \infty$  in (10.10), we obtain in particular that

$$(10.13) \quad [P_{j, j+1}, U_n] = 0 \quad (2 \leq j \leq n-1).$$

Note that the linear space  $\text{End}(V^{\otimes n})$  has a basis

$$\{\tau_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \tau_n \mid \tau_j = \sigma^+, \sigma^-, \sigma^z \text{ or } 1\}$$

Because of (10.11) and (10.13), we can write

$$U_n = \sum_{\epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n = \pm} C_{\epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n} \otimes \sigma^{\epsilon_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma^{\epsilon_n}$$

with some  $C_{\epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n} \in \text{End}(V)$ . In view of (10.13), they are symmetric with respect to  $\epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n$ . Since  $(\sigma^\pm \otimes \sigma^\pm) \mathcal{P}^- = 0$  and  $(\sigma^+ \otimes \sigma^- + \sigma^- \otimes \sigma^+) \mathcal{P}^- \neq 0$ , (10.12) and (10.13) imply that  $U_n$  has the form

$$U_n = \begin{cases} A_+ \otimes \sigma^+ \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma^+ + A_- \otimes \sigma^- \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma^- & (n \geq 3) \\ a_+ \sigma^+ \otimes \sigma^+ + a_- \sigma^- \otimes \sigma^- & (n = 2) \end{cases}$$

with some  $A_\pm \in \text{End}(V)$ ,  $a_\pm \in \mathbb{C}$ . In either case, the zero weight property (10.9) enforces that  $U_n = 0$ .

Hence we have proved  $Q_n = 0$ .

## 11. PROOF OF RECURRENCE RELATION

Finally let us prove (4.6).

The case of  $i = 1$  follows from  $\mathcal{P}_{1, \bar{1}}^- s_{1, \bar{2}} s_{\bar{1}, 2} = \frac{1}{2} s_{1, \bar{1}} s_{2, \bar{2}}$  and (5.8). Let us consider the case with  $i \geq 2$ .

From the exchange relation (4.1) it suffices to prove the case of  $(i, j) = (2, 3)$ . Set  $Z''(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = {}_{n-1}\Pi_n \circ {}_n X_{n-2}^{(2,3)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) - {}_{n-1}X_{n-3}^{(1,2)}(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-3}\Pi_{n-2}$ .

From (4.2) for  ${}_n X_{n-2}^{(2,3)}$  and using

$${}_{n-1}\Pi_n \circ A_n^{(2)}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) = A_{n-1}^{(1)}(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-1}\Pi_n.$$

we obtain

$$Z''(\lambda_1, \lambda_2 - 1, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n) = -A_{n-1}^{(1)}(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \cdot Z''(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n).$$

The initial conditions (5.15) and (8.2) imply that  $Z''(\lambda_1, \lambda_3 - 2, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n) = 0$ . This proves  $Z''(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = 0$ .

## 12. ANOTHER REPRESENTATION OF $h_n$

There is an alternative way to write the formula for  $h_n$ , which should be useful for further applications. The main result of our study is given by (3.9):

$$\begin{aligned} h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) &= \sum_{m=0}^{[n/2]} \frac{(-1)^m}{2^{n-2m}} \sum \Omega_{K_1, (i_1, j_1)} \circ \Omega_{K_2, (i_2, j_2)} \circ \cdots \circ \Omega_{K_m, (i_m, j_m)}(\mathbf{s}_{n-2m}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $K_1$  is the standard set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $K_{p+1} = K_p \setminus \{i_p, j_p\}$ , and  $\Omega_{K, (i, j)}$  is related with  ${}_m \Omega_{m-2}^{(k, l)}$  by (3.8),  $m = \sharp(K)$  being the cardinality of  $K$ . The main object of our formula

$${}_n \Omega_{n-2}^{(i, j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \text{Hom}(V^{\otimes 2(n-2)}, V^{\otimes 2n})$$

is given by (3.3), (3.6) and (3.7).

Recall  ${}_{n-1}\Pi_n \in \text{Hom}(V^{\otimes 2n}, V^{\otimes 2(n-1)})$  given by (2.8). We use the notation  ${}_{n-2}\Pi_n = {}_{n-2}\Pi_{n-1} \circ {}_{n-1}\Pi_n$ , etc.. Let us introduce an operator

$$(12.1) \quad \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = -4_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-2}\Pi_n \circ \mathbb{R}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1}$$

where  $\mathbb{R}_n^{(i,j)}$  is defined in (3.4).

Similarly to (3.7) we set

$$\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \tilde{\omega}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \widetilde{W}_n^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) + \omega(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) W_n^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n),$$

where

$$(12.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \widetilde{W}_n^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) &= -4\widetilde{G}_n^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \circ {}_{n-2}\Pi_n \circ \mathbb{R}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1} \\ W_n^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) &= -4G_n^{(i,j)}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \circ {}_{n-2}\Pi_n \circ \mathbb{R}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \text{End}(V^{\otimes 2n}).$$

In what follows we shall often omit the arguments  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  in  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$ , since they are always the same.

**Lemma 12.1.** *For  $i < j$  and  $k < l$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(k,l)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} \neq \emptyset; \\ -4_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-2}\Omega_{n-4}^{(k',l')}(\lambda_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_i, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_j, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ \quad \times {}_{n-4}\Pi_{n-2} \circ \mathbb{R}_{n-2}^{(i',j')}(\lambda_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_k, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_l, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1} & \text{if } \{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} = \emptyset. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Here  $k'$  and  $l'$  are the positions of  $\lambda_k$  and  $\lambda_l$  in  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_i, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_j, \dots, \lambda_n)$  and  $i'$  and  $j'$  are the positions of  $\lambda_i$  and  $\lambda_j$  in  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_k, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_l, \dots, \lambda_n)$ .

*Proof.* Using the exchange relation (4.1) one finds

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{R}_n^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1} {}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(k,l)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ &= {}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(k'',l'')}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \lambda_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_i, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_j, \dots, \lambda_n) \mathbb{R}_{n-2}^{(i',j')}(\lambda_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_k, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_l, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $k''$  and  $l''$  are the positions of  $\lambda_k$  and  $\lambda_l$  in  $(\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \lambda_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_i, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_j, \dots, \lambda_n)$ . Using (4.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &{}_{n-2}\Pi_n \circ {}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(k'',l'')}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j, \lambda_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_i, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_j, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} \neq \emptyset; \\ {}_{n-2}\Omega_{n-4}^{(k',l')}(\lambda_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_i, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_j, \dots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-4}\Pi_{n-2} & \text{if } \{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} = \emptyset. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two equalities, we obtain the assertion.  $\square$

The exchange relation for  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$  takes the following form.

**Lemma 12.2.** *The operators  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$  satisfy the exchange relations:*

$$(12.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \check{R}_{k,k+1}(\lambda_{k,k+1}) \check{R}_{\overline{k+1},\overline{k}}(\lambda_{k+1,k}) \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}(\cdots, \lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1}, \cdots) = \\ = \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(\pi_k(i), \pi_k(j))}(\cdots, \lambda_{k+1}, \lambda_k, \cdots) \check{R}_{k,k+1}(\lambda_{k,k+1}) \check{R}_{\overline{k+1},\overline{k}}(\lambda_{k+1,k}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\pi_k$  denotes the transposition  $(k, k+1)$ .

*Proof.* The statement follows immediately from (4.1) and the relation

$${}_{n-1}\Pi_n \circ \check{R}_{1,2}(\lambda_{l,l'}) \check{R}_{\overline{2},\overline{1}}(\lambda_{l',l}) = {}_{n-1}\Pi_n.$$

□

An important property of  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$  is their commutativity:

**Lemma 12.3.** *The operators  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$  are commutative,*

$$(12.4) \quad \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)} \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(k,l)} = \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)} \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(k,l)} \quad \text{for all } i < j, k < l.$$

*Proof.* In view of the exchange relation (12.3), the proof is reduced to the case  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$ ,  $(k, l) = (3, 4)$ . Using Lemma 12.1 and noting that  $\mathbb{R}_n^{(1,2)} = 1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(1,2)} \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(3,4)} &= 16 {}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(1,2)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-2}\Omega_{n-4}^{(1,2)}(\lambda_3, \lambda_4, \cdots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-4}\Pi_n \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{R}_n^{(3,4)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n)^{-1}, \\ \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(3,4)} \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(1,2)} &= 16 {}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(3,4)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-2}\Omega_{n-4}^{(1,2)}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_5, \cdots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-4}\Pi_n. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$${}_{n-4}\Pi_n \circ \mathbb{R}_n^{(3,4)}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n)^{-1} = {}_{n-4}\Pi_n,$$

the Lemma reduces to the commutativity (4.4). □

Using Lemma 12.1 and the equality (10.5), we see that

$$(12.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i_1, j_1)} \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i_2, j_2)} \cdots \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i_m, j_m)} \mathbf{s}_n = \\ = \begin{cases} (-4)^m \Omega_{K_1, (i_1, j_1)} \circ \cdots \circ \Omega_{K_m, (i_m, j_m)}(\mathbf{s}_{n-2m}) & \text{if } \{i_1, j_1, \dots, i_m, j_m\} \text{ are distinct;} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In comparison to the original formula, this provides a certain progress since in the left hand side the number of  $\lambda$ 's does not change along the product.

Consider the operator

$$\widehat{\Omega}_n = \sum_{i < j} \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}.$$

From the formulae (12.5) we find the following nice representation for  $h_n$ :

**Theorem 12.4.** *The formula for  $h_n(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n)$  can be rewritten using the operator  $\widehat{\Omega}_n$ :*

$$(12.6) \quad h_n(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) = 2^{-n} e^{\widehat{\Omega}_n(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n)} \mathbf{s}_n.$$

*Proof.* Expand the exponential into a power series in  $\widehat{\Omega}_n$ . Due to commutativity (12.4) and the first relation in Lemma 12.1, we have the nilpotent property

$$\frac{1}{m!}(\widehat{\Omega}_n)^m = 0 \quad \text{for } m > \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil,$$

since for such  $m$  there are necessarily coincident indices  $(i, j)$  of  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$ . Hence the series terminates. The terms

$$\frac{1}{m!}(\widehat{\Omega}_n)^m \quad \text{for } m \leq \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil$$

contain non-vanishing expressions, which due to the second relation in (12.5) can be written as

$$\Omega_{K_1, (i_1, j_1)} \circ \Omega_{K_2, (i_2, j_2)} \circ \cdots \circ \Omega_{K_m, (i_m, j_m)} (\mathbf{s}_{n-2m})$$

with  $\{i_p, j_p\} \cap \{i_q, j_q\} = \emptyset$  for all  $p, q$ . For every ordered set  $i_1 < \cdots < i_m$  there are  $m!$  terms, all of which are equal due to commutativity (12.4).  $\square$

This is a proper place to discuss the problem of taking the homogeneous limit  $\lambda_j \rightarrow 0$  ( $\forall j$ ). At present we do not know how to take this limit, but we hope that the formula (12.6) will help to solve this problem. At least it makes clear that the singularities at  $\lambda_k = \lambda_j$  which persist in our formulae are actually spurious.

**Lemma 12.5.** *The operator  $\widehat{\Omega}_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  is regular at  $\lambda_k = \lambda_j$ .*

*Proof.* Because of the exchange relation (12.3), it suffices to consider the pole at  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ . Let us examine each summand which enter the definition of  $\widehat{\Omega}_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ .

Terms  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$  with  $3 \leq i < j$  do not have a pole. The term  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(1,2)}$  is also regular by Lemma 5.4. The remaining terms are  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(1,i)}$  and  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(2,i)}$  with  $3 \leq i$ . Noting the relation

$$\begin{aligned} & \check{R}_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2}) \check{R}_{2,\bar{1}}(\lambda_{2,1}) \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(1,i)}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots) \\ &= \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(2,i)}(\lambda_2, \lambda_1, \dots) \check{R}_{1,2}(\lambda_{1,2}) \check{R}_{2,\bar{1}}(\lambda_{2,1}) \end{aligned}$$

and that  $\check{R}(0) = 1$ , we see that the residues of  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(1,i)}$  and  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(2,i)}$  pairwise cancel.  $\square$

The problem of writing down a simple formula for  $\widehat{\Omega}_n$  in the homogeneous limit remains open. Simple idea of presenting  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$  as a specialization of some commuting family of transfer matrices with arbitrary dimension and spectral parameter cannot be true for the following reason. The operators  $\widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$  are commutative, but they are nilpotent. So, they are not diagonalizable while transfer matrices are. We leave the study of these remarkable operators for the future.

### 13. CORRELATION FUNCTIONS OF THE XXZ MODEL

In this section we discuss the connection between the solutions constructed in Theorem 3.1 and correlation functions of the XXZ spin chain with the Hamiltonian

$$(13.1) \quad H_{XXZ} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j (\sigma_j^x \sigma_{j+1}^x + \sigma_j^y \sigma_{j+1}^y + \Delta \sigma_j^z \sigma_{j+1}^z).$$

Here  $\Delta = \cos \pi \nu$ . We consider the two regimes,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &\in i\mathbb{R}_{>0} && \text{(massive regime),} \\ 0 < \nu < 1 && \text{(massless regime).} \end{aligned}$$

We consider also an inhomogeneous model in which a spectral parameter  $\lambda_j$  is associated with each site  $j$ . Let  $(E_{\epsilon, \bar{\epsilon}})_j$  be the matrix unit acting on the  $j$ -th site of the lattice. Denoting by  $|\text{vac}\rangle$  the normalized ground state of (13.1), let

$$h_n^{Corr}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n, \bar{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \bar{\epsilon}_n} = \prod_{p=1}^n (-\bar{\epsilon}_p) \langle \text{vac} | (E_{-\epsilon_1, \bar{\epsilon}_1})_1 \cdots (E_{-\epsilon_n, \bar{\epsilon}_n})_n | \text{vac} \rangle$$

be the correlation function in the thermodynamic limit. It is known [10] that the  $V^{\otimes 2n}$ -valued function

$$\begin{aligned} &h_n^{Corr}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ &= \sum h_n^{Corr}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n, \bar{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \bar{\epsilon}_n} v_{\epsilon_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{\epsilon_n} \otimes v_{\bar{\epsilon}_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{\bar{\epsilon}_n} \end{aligned}$$

is a solution of the reduced qKZ equation<sup>1</sup> (2.3), (2.4) as well as (2.5).

From the known integral representation [11, 8, 14], it can be shown that  $h_n^{Corr}$  is meromorphic, the only possible poles being simple poles at  $\lambda_i - \lambda_j = l + l'/\nu$ , ( $l, l' \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $i \neq j$ ). Moreover it is holomorphic at  $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$ .

Let us compare the correlation functions with the solution (3.9) constructed in Theorem 3.1. For this purpose we make a specific choice of the solutions  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda)$ ,  $\omega(\lambda)$  of (2.12) with similar analyticity properties. Set

$$(13.2) \quad \omega(\lambda) := c \frac{d}{d\lambda} \log \rho(\lambda) + \frac{1}{4} \frac{[2]}{[\lambda + 1][\lambda - 1]},$$

$$(13.3) \quad \tilde{\omega}(\lambda) := c \frac{d}{d\lambda} \log \tilde{\rho}(\lambda) - \frac{1}{4} \frac{[2\lambda]}{[\lambda + 1][\lambda - 1]}.$$

where  $c = (\sin \pi \nu)/\pi \nu$ . The functions  $\rho(\lambda)$ ,  $\tilde{\rho}(\lambda)$  are specified in each regime as follows:

$$(13.4) \quad \rho(\lambda) := \begin{cases} -\zeta \frac{(\zeta^{-2})_{\infty} (q^2 \zeta^2)_{\infty}}{(\zeta^2)_{\infty} (q^2 \zeta^{-2})_{\infty}} & \text{(massive regime),} \\ -\frac{S_2(-\lambda) S_2(1 + \lambda)}{S_2(\lambda) S_2(1 - \lambda)} & \text{(massless regime),} \end{cases}$$

$$(13.5) \quad \tilde{\rho}(\lambda) := \begin{cases} \frac{\{q^2 \zeta^2\} \{q^6 \zeta^2\} \{q^2 \zeta^{-2}\} \{q^6 \zeta^{-2}\}}{\{q^4 \zeta^2\}^2 \{q^4 \zeta^{-2}\}^2} & \text{(massive regime),} \\ \frac{S_3(1 - \lambda) S_3(3 - \lambda)}{S_3(2 - \lambda)^2} \frac{S_3(1 + \lambda) S_3(3 + \lambda)}{S_3(2 + \lambda)^2} & \text{(massless regime).} \end{cases}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>In the massive regime, the ground states are two-fold degenerate. Matrix elements taken between the different ground states satisfy a similar equation with opposite sign. We do not discuss them here.

We have set  $\zeta = e^{\pi i \nu \lambda}$ ,

$$(z)_\infty = (z; q^4)_\infty, \quad \{z\} := (z; q^4, q^4)_\infty, \\ S_2(\lambda) := S_2(\lambda|2, \frac{1}{\nu}), \quad S_3(\lambda) := S_3(\lambda|2, 2, \frac{1}{\nu}),$$

where  $(z; p_1, \dots, p_r)_\infty := \prod_{j_1, \dots, j_r \geq 0} (1 - p_1^{j_1} \cdots p_r^{j_r} z)$ , and  $S_r(\lambda|\omega_1, \dots, \omega_r)$  denotes the multiple sine function.

**Lemma 13.1.** *The functions  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda), \omega(\lambda)$  given by (13.2)–(13.5) are the unique solutions of the difference equation (2.12) which are holomorphic and bounded in the strip  $-1 + \delta \leq \operatorname{Re} \lambda \leq 1 - \delta$  for any  $0 < \delta < 1$ .*

*Proof.* Direct verification shows that the functions (13.2)–(13.5) possess the required properties. To see the uniqueness, suppose  $\tilde{\omega}_i(\lambda), \omega_i(\lambda)$  are two solutions with the same properties, and set  $\tilde{\omega}'(\lambda) = \tilde{\omega}_1(\lambda) - \tilde{\omega}_2(\lambda)$ ,  $\omega'(\lambda) = \omega_1(\lambda) - \omega_2(\lambda)$ . Then  $\omega'(\lambda-1) + \omega'(\lambda) = 0$  and  $\tilde{\omega}'(\lambda-1) + \tilde{\omega}'(\lambda) + \omega'(\lambda) = 0$ . Therefore  $\omega'(\lambda)$  is holomorphic everywhere. Together with the boundedness we conclude that  $\omega'(\lambda) = 0$ . Now the same argument applies to show that  $\tilde{\omega}'(\lambda) = 0$ .  $\square$

Denote by  $h_n^{\text{Ansatz}}$  the solution constructed in Theorem 3.1 with the above choice of  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda), \omega(\lambda)$ . The following lemma shows that the two families of solutions  $\{h_n^{\text{Ansatz}}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ ,  $\{h_n^{\text{Corr}}\}_{n=0}^\infty$  share the same inductive pole structure at  $\lambda_i - \lambda_j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ .

**Lemma 13.2.** *Let  $\{h_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$  be a solution of the system (2.3)–(2.5). Assume further that  $h_n$  is holomorphic at  $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Then it is also holomorphic at  $\lambda_i = \lambda_j \pm 1$ . We have*

$$(13.6) \quad \mathcal{P}_{1,2}^- h_n(\lambda_2 - 1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) = \frac{1}{2} s_{1,2} s_{\bar{1},\bar{2}} h_{n-2}(\lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n)_{3, \dots, n, \bar{n}, \dots, \bar{3}},$$

$$(13.7) \quad c^{-1} \operatorname{res}_{\lambda_i = \lambda_j + l} h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ = (-1)^{l-1} {}_n X_{n-2}^{(i,j)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \Big|_{\lambda_{i,j}=l} \left( h_{n-2}(\lambda_1, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_i, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_j, \dots, \lambda_n) \right),$$

where  $i < j$ ,  $l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $A_n^{(k)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  is holomorphic at  $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$ , the regularity of  $h_n$  at  $\lambda_i = \lambda_j \pm 1$  is a consequence of the reduced qKZ equation. To show (13.6), we use the formula

$$A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \Big|_{\lambda_1 = \lambda_2} = (-1)^n r_{\bar{1},\bar{2}} (-1) t_{n,\bar{1}}^{[1,2]}(\lambda_2) P_{1,\bar{1}} P_{1,2} \\ = -2 P_{1,\bar{1}} P_{1,2} \mathcal{P}_{2,\bar{2}}^- A_{n-1}^{(1)}(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)_{2, \dots, n, \bar{n}, \dots, \bar{2}}.$$

Specializing (2.4), we obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_{1,2}^- h_n(\lambda_2 - 1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) = -2 P_{1,\bar{1}} P_{1,2} \mathcal{P}_{1,\bar{1}}^- \mathcal{P}_{2,\bar{2}}^- \\ \times A_{n-1}^{(1)}(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)_{2, \dots, n, \bar{n}, \dots, \bar{2}} h_n(\lambda_2, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n).$$

Applying (2.5) and then using the reduced qKZ equation (2.4) for  $h_{n-1}$ , we rewrite the right hand side as

$$\begin{aligned} & -P_{1,\bar{1}}P_{1,2}\mathcal{P}_{2,\bar{2}}^{-1}A_{n-1}^{(1)}(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)_{2,\dots,n,\bar{n},\dots,\bar{2}}s_{1,\bar{1}}h_{n-1}(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)_{2,\dots,n,\bar{n},\dots,\bar{2}} \\ & = -P_{1,\bar{1}}P_{1,2}\mathcal{P}_{2,\bar{2}}^{-1}s_{1,\bar{1}}h_{n-1}(\lambda_2 - 1, \dots, \lambda_n)_{2,\dots,n,\bar{n},\dots,\bar{2}} \\ & = -P_{1,\bar{1}}P_{1,2}\frac{1}{2}s_{1,\bar{1}}s_{2,\bar{2}}h_{n-2}(\lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n)_{3,\dots,n,\bar{n},\dots,\bar{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

The assertion follows from this.

Let us prove (13.7). We consider the case  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  and  $l = -k - 1$  with  $k \geq 0$ . The other cases follow from (2.3) and (4.1).

Using (2.4) and the regularity of  $h_n$  at  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ , we see that the left hand side of (13.7) is regular at  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 - 1$ . By (5.14),  ${}_nX_{n-2}^{(1,2)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  is 0 for  $\lambda_{1,2} = -1$ . Hence (13.7) holds for  $k = 0$ .

For  $k = 1$ , we apply (5.15) to the right hand side of (13.7). We use (2.4) and

$$c^{-1}\text{res}_{\lambda_1=\lambda_2-1}A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = 2(-1)^n \frac{1}{[2]}r_{\bar{1},\bar{2}}(-2)t_{n,\bar{1}}^{[1,2]}(\lambda_2 - 1)P_{1,\bar{1}}\mathcal{P}_{1,2}^{-1}$$

to the left hand side of (13.7). Then, using (13.6), we obtain the equality.

In the general case  $k \geq 2$ , the residue of both sides of (2.4) gives

$$\text{res}_{\lambda_1=\lambda_2-k-1}h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_2 - k, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \text{res}_{\lambda_1=\lambda_2-k}h_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n).$$

Using the difference equation (4.2), we obtain (13.7) by induction.  $\square$

Let us prove that in the massive case the correlation functions are given by  $h_n^{\text{Ansatz}}$ .

**Lemma 13.3.** *Let  $q$  be a complex number with  $0 < |q| < 1$ . Consider a  $q$ -difference equation*

$$f(q^{-1}\zeta) = B(\zeta)f(\zeta)$$

where  $B(\zeta)$  is a matrix and  $f(\zeta)$  is a vector valued function. Assume that  $B(\zeta)$  is holomorphic at  $\zeta = \infty$ , and  $f(\zeta)$  is holomorphic on  $R \leq |\zeta| < \infty$ . Then  $f(\zeta)$  has at most a pole at  $\zeta = \infty$ .

*Proof.* Set  $M = \sup_{|\zeta| \geq R} |B(\zeta)|$ ,  $K_0 = \sup_{R \leq |\zeta| \leq |q^{-1}R|} |f(\zeta)|$ . For any non-negative integer  $n$ , we have in the domain  $|q^{-n}R| \leq |\zeta| \leq |q^{-n-1}R|$

$$|f(\zeta)| = |B(q\zeta) \cdots B(q^n\zeta)f(q^n\zeta)| \leq M^n K_0.$$

Hence there exist  $K, N > 0$  such that

$$|f(\zeta)| \leq K|\zeta|^N \quad (|\zeta| \geq R).$$

The assertion follows from this.  $\square$

**Theorem 13.4.** *In the massive regime, we have*

$$h_n^{\text{Corr}}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = h_n^{\text{Ansatz}}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n).$$

*Proof.* First we note that, in the massive regime,

$$\prod_{p=1}^n \zeta_p^{(\epsilon_p + \bar{\epsilon}_p)/2} \times (h_n^{Corr}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n))^{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n, \bar{\epsilon}_n, \dots, \bar{\epsilon}_1}$$

is a single-valued function of  $\zeta_j^2$  ( $1 \leq j \leq n$ ) (see [9], eq.(9.4)), and that  $\tilde{\omega}(\lambda), \omega(\lambda)$  are also single-valued functions of  $\zeta^2$ . From the definition of  ${}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$  and (5.10),  $h_n^{Ansatz}$  has the same functional form.

To prove the theorem, we proceed by induction on  $n$ . The cases  $n = 0$  and  $1$  are obvious. Suppose  $h_m^{Corr} = h_m^{Ansatz}$  for  $m < n$ , and consider the difference  $f(\zeta) = h_n^{Corr} - h_n^{Ansatz}$  viewed as a function of  $\zeta = \zeta_1$ . We have

$$(13.8) \quad f(q^{-1}\zeta) = B(\zeta)f(\zeta)$$

where  $B(\zeta) = A_n^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ . Let us show that  $f(\zeta) \equiv 0$ .

By the induction hypothesis, Lemma 13.2 and the remark made above,  $f(\zeta)$  is holomorphic on  $\mathbb{C}^\times$  and satisfies

$$(13.9) \quad \mathcal{P}_{1,\bar{1}}^- f(\zeta) = 0.$$

The matrix  $B(\zeta)$  is rational in  $\zeta$  and has the following behavior at  $\zeta = \infty$ :

$$B(\zeta) = (-q^S + O(\zeta^{-1})) P_{1,\bar{1}},$$

where

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\bar{1}}^z \sum_{p=2}^n (\sigma_p^z + \sigma_{\bar{p}}^z).$$

By Lemma (13.3),  $f(\zeta)$  has at most a pole at  $\zeta = \infty$ . Suppose  $f(\zeta) \not\equiv 0$ , and let  $f(\zeta) = \zeta^k f_0 + O(\zeta^{k-1})$  ( $f_0 \neq 0$ ) be the Laurent expansion. Then (13.8), (13.9) stipulate that

$$q^{-k} f_0 = -q^S P_{1,\bar{1}} f_0 = -q^S f_0.$$

Since  $S$  has integer eigenvalues and  $0 < |q| < 1$ , this is a contradiction.  $\square$

Unfortunately, the above reasoning does not carry over to the massless regime because of the presence of ‘extra’ poles  $\lambda_{i,j} = l + l'/\nu$ . For  $n = 2, 3$ , the equality  $h_n^{Corr} = h_n^{Ansatz}$  can be shown by direct computation of the integrals. We have also checked for  $n = 4$  and some components that  $h_n^{Ansatz}$  agrees with the known results about homogeneous chains [12]. On these grounds, we conjecture that  $h_n^{Corr} = h_n^{Ansatz}$  holds in the massless regime as well.

Let us comment on the rational limit. The limit to the XXX model corresponds to replacing  $[\mu]$  by  $\mu$  everywhere. The functions  $\tilde{\omega}, \omega$  defined by (13.2)–(13.5) tend in both massive and massless cases to the same functions  $\tilde{\omega}^{XXX}, \omega^{XXX}$  which satisfy the equation (2.12) and <sup>2</sup>

$$(13.10) \quad \tilde{\omega}^{XXX}(\lambda) = -\lambda \omega^{XXX}(\lambda).$$

---

<sup>2</sup>The function  $\omega^{XXX}(\lambda)$  is related to  $\omega(\lambda)$  in [1] by  $\omega(\lambda) = (\lambda^2 - 1) \omega^{XXX}(\lambda)$ .

The function  ${}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j)}$  becomes in this limit a rational function  ${}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j) XXX}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ . The expressions for  ${}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(i,j)}, \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j)}$  simplify due to (13.10):

$$(13.11) \quad \begin{aligned} {}_n\Omega_{n-2}^{(i,j) XXX}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) &= \omega^{XXX}(\lambda_{i,j}) \cdot {}_nX_{n-2}^{(i,j) XXX}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n), \\ \widehat{\Omega}_n^{(i,j) XXX}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) &= \omega^{XXX}(\lambda_{i,j}) \cdot W_n^{(i,j) XXX}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(13.12) \quad \begin{aligned} W_n^{(i,j) XXX}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ = -4X_n^{(i,j) XXX}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \circ {}_{n-2}\Pi_n \circ \mathbb{R}_n^{(i,j) XXX}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

with  $\mathbb{R}_n^{(i,j) XXX}$  being given by the same formula (3.4) with  $R$  replaced by the rational  $R$ -matrix.

*Acknowledgments.* Research of HB is supported by INTAS grant #00-00561 and by the RFFI grant #04-01-00352. Research of MJ is partially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research B2-16340033. Research of TM is partially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research A1-13304010. Research of FS is supported by INTAS grant #03-51-3350 and by EC networks "EUCLID", contract number HPRN-CT-2002-00325 and "ENIGMA", contract number MRTN-CT-2004-5652. Research of YT is partially supported by University of Tsukuba Research Project.

HB and FS are grateful for warm hospitality to the University of Tokyo where this work was finished.

HB would also like to thank K. Fabricius, F.Göhmman, A.Klümper, P. Pyatov, M.Shioishi and M.Takahashi for useful discussions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. Boos, M. Jimbo, T. Miwa, F. Smirnov and Y. Takeyama, A recursion formula for the correlation functions of an inhomogeneous XXX model, hep-th/0405044. to appear in Algebra and Analysis.
- [2] H. Boos and V. Korepin, Quantum spin chains and Riemann zeta functions with odd arguments, hep-th/0104008, *J. Phys. A* **34** (2001) 5311–5316.
- [3] H. Boos, V. Korepin and F. Smirnov, Emptiness formation probability and quantum Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equation, hep-th/0209246, *Nucl. Phys. B* Vol. 658/3 (2003) 417–439.
- [4] H. Boos, V. Korepin and F. Smirnov, New formulae for solutions of quantum Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equations on level  $-4$ , hep-th/0304077, *J. Phys. A* **37** (2004) 323–336.
- [5] H. Boos, V. Korepin and F. Smirnov, New formulae for solutions of quantum Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equations on level  $-4$  and correlation functions, hep-th/0305135, *Moscow Math. J.* **4** (2004) 593–617.
- [6] H. Boos, V. Korepin and F. Smirnov, Connecting lattice and relativistic models via conformal field theory, math-ph/0311020.
- [7] H. Boos, M. Shioishi and M. Takahashi, "First principle approach to correlation functions of spin-1/2 Heisenberg chain: fourth-neighbor correlators", hep-th/0410039.
- [8] M. Jimbo and T. Miwa, Quantum Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equation at  $|q| = 1$  and correlation functions of the XXZ model in the gapless regime, *J. Phys. A* **29** (1996) 2923–2958

- [9] M. Jimbo and T. Miwa, Algebraic analysis of solvable lattice models, *Reg. Conf. Ser. in Math.* **85**, 1995.
- [10] M. Idzumi, K. Iohara, M. Jimbo, T. Miwa, T. Nakashima and T. Tokihiro, Quantum affine symmetry in vertex models, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **8** (1993) 1479–1511.
- [11] M. Jimbo, T. Miwa, K. Miki and A. Nakayashiki, Correlation functions of the XXZ model for  $\Delta < -1$ , *Phys. Lett. A* **168** (1992), 256–263.
- [12] G. Kato, M. Shiroishi, M. Takahashi, K. Sakai, Third-neighbor and other four-point correlation functions of spin-1/2 XXZ chain, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **36** (2003) L337.
- [13] G. Kato, M. Shiroishi, M. Takahashi, K. Sakai, Next Nearest-Neighbor Correlation Functions of the Spin-1/2 XXZ Chain at Critical Region, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37** (2004) 5097.
- [14] N. Kitanine, J.-M. Maillet and V. Terras, Correlation functions of the XXZ Heisenberg spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ -chain in a magnetic field, *Nucl. Phys. B* **567** (2000), 554–582.
- [15] M. Takahashi, G. Kato, M. Shiroishi, Next Nearest-Neighbor Correlation Functions of the Spin-1/2 XXZ Chain at Massive Region, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **73** (2004) 245.

HB: PHYSICS DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF WUPPERTAL, D-42097, WUPPERTAL, GERMANY<sup>3</sup>

*E-mail address:* boos@physik.uni-wuppertal.de

MJ: GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, TOKYO 153-8914, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* jimbomic@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

TM: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* tetsuji@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp

FS<sup>4</sup>: LABORATOIRE DE PHYSIQUE THÉORIQUE ET HAUTES ENERGIES, UNIVERSITÉ PIERRE ET MARIE CURIE, TOUR 16 1<sup>er</sup> ÉTAGE, 4 PLACE JUSSIEU 75252 PARIS CEDEX 05, FRANCE

*E-mail address:* smirnov@lpthe.jussieu.fr

YT: GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PURE AND APPLIED SCIENCES, TSUKUBA UNIVERSITY, TSUKUBA, IBARAKI 305-8571, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* takeyama@math.tsukuba.ac.jp

---

<sup>3</sup>on leave of absence from the Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, 142281, Russia

<sup>4</sup>Membre du CNRS